VOLUME XXXVI No. 4

The Catholic Historical Review

ALOYSIUS K. ZIEGLER MARTIN R. P. McGUIRE
JOHN TRACY ELLIS
Managing Editor

ADVISORY EDITORS
MANOEL CARDOZO **PAUL KINIERY** **ROBERT F. McNAMARA**
WILLIAM L. DAVIS **THOMAS T. McAVOY** **JOSEPH N. MOODY**

Table of Contents

JANUARY, 1951

ARTICLES

Louis Veuillot . . . . *Waldemar Gurian* 385

A Conciliar Theory of the Thirteenth Century
Brian Tierney 415

MISCELLANY

Land for a Cathedral: Baltimore, 1806-1817
William D. Hoyt, Jr. 441

BOOK REVIEWS 446

NOTES AND COMMENTS 485

BRIEF NOTICES 493

PERIODICAL LITERATURE 502

BOOKS RECEIVED 507

BOOK REVIEWS

Miscellanea Pio Paschini. Studi di storia ecclesiastica. Henry G. J. Beck 446

Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. (Harry Austryn Wolfson). Patrick W. Skehan 448

Christianity and History. (Herbert Butterfield). Ross J. S. Hoffman 450

Justin the First. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great. (A. A. Vasiliev). Cyril Toumanoff 453

Histoire de l'église en Belgique. (E. de Moreau, S.J.). Charles H. Lynch 455

Friar Felix at Large. A Fifteenth Century Pilgrimage to the Holy Land. (H. F. M. Prescott). Henry A. Callahan 456

Russische Denker. (Bernard Schultze). George J. Undreiner 458

The History of the Popes. Volume XXXV. *Benedict XIV (1740-1758).* (Ludwig von Pastor). Carl J. Steinbicker 459

Window on Maynooth. (Denis Meehan). Hugh J. Nolan 460

The Papacy and European Diplomacy, 1869-1878. (Lillian Parker Wallace). Friedrich Engel-Janosi 461

Daniel Mannix. Archbishop of Melbourne. (Frank Murphy). Joseph P. Christopher 464

Cardinal Mindszenty Speaks. (Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty). Tibor Kerekes 465

The Catholic Church in the United States. (Theodore Roemer, O.F.M. Cap.). Henry J. Browne 467

Jesuit and Savage in New France. (J. H. Kennedy). Robert F. McNamara 470

Sisters of St. Joseph of Philadelphia. A Century of Growth and Development, 1847-1947. (Sister Maria Kostka Logue). Edward T. Harrington 471

Hands to the Needy. (Sister Mary Pauline Fitts, G.N.S.H.). Sister M. Rosalita Kelly 473

The Catholic University of America, 1903-1909. The Rectorship of Denis J. O'Connell. (Colman J. Barry, O.S.B.). John K. Cartwright 474

A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York. Volume V. *The Rectorship of Dr. Morgan Dix.* (John A. Dix and Leicester C. Lewis). Mother Mary Peter Carthy 476

A History of Spain from the Beginnings to the Present Day. (Rafael Altamira). Manoel Cardozo 477

Germany, 2000 Years. (Kurt F. Reinhardt). Francis J. Tschan 478

The Italian Madrigal. (Alfred Einstein). Russell Woollen 479

History of Education. (Patrick J. McCormick). Timothy F. O'Leary ... 482

Revival of Paganism. (Gustave Combès). Henry W. Casper 483

The Catholic Historical Review

Vol. XXXVI JANUARY, 1951 No. 4

LOUIS VEUILLOT

By

WALDEMAR GURIAN*

In 1840 when Louis Veuillot started his career as a Catholic journalist he confessed that all his relatives were "living in the most inferior levels of society; they are workers, peasants, small merchants. I am probably the first of the family who knows how to spell his name."[1] Veuillot was a son of the people.[2] His father, a barrel maker *(tonellier)*, had been forced by financial troubles to move to a suburb of Paris where young Louis, born in 1813, joined him after a stay with his grandparents in the country. The education of the future editor of the *Univers* was very elementary. The same must be said of his religious lessons. Veuillot's father was not a practicing Catholic; his mother went to church only occasionally. In 1838 when Louis had become a fervent Catholic he was obliged to reassure his parents in a special letter that he had not endangered his future.[3] Young Veuillot received as the usual formality, required in France of this time, his first Communion, an experience which did not make any lasting impression. That he had applied by letter to the Archbishop of Paris for admission to the little seminary of the archdiocese—by the way, he received no answer—is no proof of piety, but only of his desire to obtain higher education. The thirteen-year old son of the humble worker was obliged to earn his living. Fortunately, his good handwriting enabled him to become a clerk—in the beginning something of a messenger boy—in the law office of Fernand Delavigne. The pay was very poor. Therefore, Veuillot had to earn additional money by working as a hod carrier in his free time. The law office was a center for people interested in literature—Casimir, the brother of the patron, was a well-known playwright. Veuillot's eagerness to read and to increase his knowledge was stimulated by his colleagues. In a comparatively short time he had reached the position of second clerk—just when the July Revolution of 1830 occurred. Later on he described with some satirical bitterness how the downfall of the Restoration started his career as journalist: "Outdistanced as soon as they were victorious, and observing that they were threatened with burial under the building which was collapsing under their attacks, the terrorized bourgeois shouted for help from all directions; they established everywhere newspapers in order to fight against the same freedom of the press which they had used for the swallowing up of a dynasty,

---

* Presidential address read at the meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association, Chicago, December 30, 1950. Mr. Gurian is professor of political science, director of the Committee on International Relations in the University of Notre Dame, and editor of the *Review of Politics.*

[1] Letter to Dumast of June 17, 1840. *Oeuvres complètes,* XV, Deuxième série. *Correspondance,* I (1831—October, 1843), 100. Henceforth the three series, *Oeuvres diverses, Correspondance,* and *Mélanges* of the *Oeuvres complètes* of Louis Veuillot (Paris, 1924, ff.) will be quoted as *Oeuv. div., Corr., Mel.* The biography of Veuillot by his brother Eugène, the fourth volume of which was to a large extent written by F. Veuillot, the son of Eugène, after the death of his father, will be quoted as *E.V.*, with the number of the volume. The very useful biography of Montalembert by Abbé Lecanuet, *Montalembert d'après son journal et sa correspondance,* 3 vols., 1st ed. (Paris, 1895-1902), which gives the point of view of the liberal Catholics, will be quoted as *Lec.* The polemics of Veuillot are described from a laicist point of view by G. Weill, *Le catholicisme libéral en France* (Paris, n.d.). Cf. also my volume on *Die politischen und sozialen Ideen des französischen Katholizimus, 1789-1914* (München-Gladbach, 1929), which will be quoted as *Ideen,* and the indispensable *Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine* by A. Dansette (Paris, 1948), Vol. I, *De la Révolution à la troisième république.*

[2] Sainte-Beuve, *Les grands écrivains français* (ed. Allem, Paris, 1930), III, 105, "Il est enfant du peuple, fils d'honnêtes gens, de gens de peine et du travail. Elevé au hasard. . . ." Cf. also P. Fernessole, *Les Origines littéraires de Louis*

Veuillot, 1813-1843 (Paris, 1923), p. 5, quoting from an unpublished manuscript of Louis Veuillot, "Je suis ignorant de naissance, de famille, de goût, et de raison. On a des siècles de noblesse ou de roture, j'en ai d'ignorance." Fernessole notes: ". . . les ancêtres de Louis Veuillot sont illettrés, beaucoup ne savent même pas lire."

[3] *Corr.*, I, 56 ff., letter of June 16, 1838. "J'ai vu avec peine qu'on vous avait donné quelques inquiétudes au sujet de mes résolutions. . . . Soyez donc bien persuadés que pour avoir un peu de religion je n'en serai pas plus mauvais frère, ni mauvais fils."

but which was now swallowing them up. Having, doubtless, neither enough brains nor enough heart to defend themselves by their own means, they took journalists where they could find them; they were obliged to accept children as defenders of the strange social order which they established."[4]

Louis Veuillot was one of these children. His activities as editor of conservative provincial papers supporting the regime of Louis Philippe (and, therefore, opposing republicans as well as adherents of the legitimate Bourbon dynasty) were so successful that he advanced after 1836 to membership on the editorial staff of Parisian publications. But he was dissatisfied; in letters to a friend, Olivier, who had become a practicing Catholic, there are some hints of religious interests. In 1838 he left, together with this friend and his wife, for a long trip which would conduct him via Rome to the Orient. In the papal capital his conversion occurred, a "prompt and easy conversion," as his brother, closest collaborator and biographer, Eugène Veuillot, correctly remarks.[5] In his letters written during this decisive journey Veuillot quoted as motives the impression made by the Catholic tradition of Rome and Italy and his worries about the responsibility for the moral life of his two sisters.[6] The example of a Catholic couple travelling with him—more even than that of the Oliviers—impressed him at a time when he was suffering from internal despair and dissatisfaction. This conversion did not dispose of Veuillot's depressions and dark moods, but it did give him the feeling and experience of absolute certainty. After his fateful trip to Rome he never had even the slightest doubts about the truth of the Catholic religion. His piety was sincere and simple; typical expressions are his endeavor to convert his friends and particularly his brother, and his moving letters to many unknown people who approached him for spiritual advice. Theological distinctions and philosophical problems did not bother Veuillot at all. His brother said that in judging Lamennais' philosophical doctrines he relied on a friend, du Lac. "His philosophers were De Maistre and de

---

[4] Quoted from Veuillot's *Rome et Lorette*, in *E.V.*, I, 49 ff.

[5] *E.V.*, I, 228.

[6] *Corr.*, I, 56 ff., letter to his brother Eugène of June 12, 1838: "C'est l'Italie plus que tout le reste qui m'a fait catholique;" I, 27, letter to his brother of March 19, 1838: "Mes inquiétudes ont surtout augmentés depuis que je vois grandir mes soeurs. Le P. Rozaven m'a offert de les faire recevoir dans un couvent."

Bonald, and he never bothered to learn if they were always in agreement."[7]

In the honesty and sincerity of his acceptance of the authority of the Church he immediately put a most important decision about his future in the hands of a spiritual adviser; whether he should stay in Fribourg or return to Paris was decided for him by a Jesuit confessor.[8] But Veuillot's happiness about his newly acquired religious certainty and rule of life—which, of course, did not always mean peace of soul—was accompanied by a radical rejection of the bourgeois society in which he had moved and whose kind of life he had shared. He had fought duels and had the usual, unimportant love affairs. Was this rejection caused by regret over his former eagerness to make a career by any means at hand? Veuillot's enemies made much of his occasional remark that he could have been as good a member of the "movement"—i.e., of radical groups opposing the policies of the bourgeois king—as of the "resistance,"[9] or the conservative right liberals of the type of Guizot who patronized him. Veuillot liked to show bitter contempt for bourgeois ambition for advancement, for success in the world. Probably even more important for Veuillot was the feeling that the bourgeois had the same disdain for the people as the aristocrats for the bourgeois. "Growing older, I discovered in life only unjustified oppressions; chance of birth made life happy for others, unbearable for myself." And according to his brother, he made against the young liberal bourgeois the same objections they had made against the privileges of nobles and priests.[10]

Having become a Catholic, Veuillot bitterly accused the society of his time, i.e., the bourgeois liberal society, of having deprived his father of an understanding of the meaning of life. "No one had taught him early enough that there is in heaven a God Who will compensate for all labors, and that to fall asleep in the arms of this mild God means to awaken for eternity. A society without feeling for the poor people and without sense for anything that goes beyond the crudest interests of a miserable life had removed from him the representatives of the Holy Word; this society did not care whether he became a decent man or whether passions made him a criminal subject to the compulsion of the brutal machines called judges and laws."[11]

---

[7] *E.V.*, I, 373.

[8] *Corr.*, I, 67, letter to Gustave Olivier, Fribourg, July 11, 1838: "J'ai remis la décision de ma conduite au P. Geoffroy. . . . Enfin, hier matin le Père m'a communiqué sa décision."

[9] *E.V.*, I, 50 (a quotation from *Rome et Lorette*). "J'avais en la foi de mes besoins; j'eus aisément celle de mes intérêts. Je me trouvai du café de la Résistance; j'aurais été tout aussi volontiers du Mouvement, et même plus volontiers."

[10] *E.V.*, I, 39.

Veuillot's correspondence after his conversion is full of violent outbreaks against the liberal bourgeois. Their journalism was ordure; and in a letter to Foisset of May 19, 1842,[12] he castigates furiously those who object to his polemics as too merciless. "Being too ignorant, I cannot avoid violence. They do not have blood—hate against a society where they occupy set places and whose velvet and laces prevent them from seeing the wounds and realizing the corruption. They ignore what goes on in the street, where they never step; but I come from there and I am staying there. If God were to tell me, 'these institutions, these arts, this civilization I will reduce to powder,' then I would kneel and I would use my right to pray only to ask Him to save their souls." The Catholic faith was expressed for Louis Veuillot in the rejection of a society which ignored God, opposed the Church or, at best, tolerated it with spiteful condescension, imposing upon it a strict and fettering control.

The educated and wealthy society prevailing in the France of his time, expressing itself in parliamentary debates, the liberal press, the official state system of education, called the University, established under Napoleon, as well as in the attitudes of those worldly and bourgeois Catholics who liked to maneuver and to compromise, to avoid conflicts, and to overlook the sins of powerful masters of modern public opinion, were regarded as *the* enemy by Veuillot. He hated this enemy ferociously because he had himself started out in this camp, until he realized that there are truth and meaning only in God and in His Church.

All human, social, and political institutions and struggles were determined for Veuillot exclusively by their relations to the Church. This convert shocked not only the liberal contemporary world by regretting in his first Catholic book, *The Pilgrimages of Switzerland,*[13] that Huss was not burned earlier and that Luther had not been burned at all. The disruption of the unity of the true faith was for Veuillot the worst social catastrophe. All problems were to be solved by a return to God and to His revealed religion. He was amazed that Foisset bothered to work on a new edition of Pascal—after all, Pascal was a Jansenist.[14] He regarded it as his mission to fight for the Church and to pursue the enemies of the Church in all fields. Away in Algiers he wrote in April, 1841: "I am frantic not to be in France to fight against Villemain (the Minister of Education), the Russian emperor, the journalists, the Vaudevillians, the Feuilletonists."[15] The Church spoke for him on all questions through the Pope; therefore, he opposed those legitimists, adherents of the Bourbon dynasty, who were unwilling to accept the recognition of the Louis Philippe regime by Gregory XVI.

---

[11] *E.V.*, I, 195.

[12] *Corr.*, I, 293 ff. Foisset enjoyed first the particular confidence of Veuillot. Later on he joined the circle of the *Correspondant* which fought the influence of Veuillot's *Univers.*

Conversion for Veuillot was a purely religious affair, not acceptance of a political line. He rejected with the utmost energy the approaches of the legitimists, at this time widely influential among French Catholics, to enroll him under their banner. He wrote on April 14, 1840, to Count O'Mahoney who hoped, as Veuillot puts it himself, "to attach me to his party and to await me, at the foot of a cross adorned with lilies" (the symbol of the Bourbon monarchy): "Too bad I have been a liberal, a doctrinaire (a group to which Guizot, etc., belonged). I wish I had talent and strength enough to wipe out all the horrible institutions of our epoch, press, parliament, colleges, grammar schools, etc." In his heart, he continues, there now lives the cross which has replaced the dunghill of his liberal youth. He is a monarchist without being the adherent of a particular king. He prays that God may send a new Christian ruler. He cannot share the legitimist faith; he hopes only that a religious renewal of the French people will enable it to side with the right cause. Many legitimists are liberals. For him the naked cross is sufficient; he would accept lilies on it only if God would add them. And he concludes, "in order to love God and our brethren let us forget the lilies and be satisfied with the cross."[16]

---

[13] *Oeuv. div.,* II.

[14] *Corr.,* I, 373 ff. Letter of April 12, 1843. "Après tout, Pascal était janseniste."

[15] *Corr.,* I, 167. Letter to E. Leclerc of April, 1841.

[16] *Corr.,* I, 96. Letter to Count O'Mahony.

When this revealing letter was written, showing Veuillot's judgment of regimes exclusively according to their religious attitudes and helping us to understand his apparent shift of political allegiances, the future leader of French Catholic journalism was in the service of Guizot. He had, after his return from Rome and Fribourg, accepted a sinecure in the Ministry of the Interior. In 1841 he was sent to Algiers as a companion of General Bugeaud, whom he liked very much and whom he defended in his first contribution to the *Univers,* the paper with which his name later became indissolubly linked. He published books about his conversion and religious experiences, he started to write articles for Catholic publications, but he complained that his official position, though not keeping him busy, prevented the completion of his literary plans. He intended to write a work in many volumes on pilgrimages in France. He became more and more known for his contributions to the *Univers.* An article by him bitterly attacking Janin, a liberal feuilletonist, well known at this time, created a sensation. But even before he became a paid contributor to the *Univers* and assumed in 1843 the function of its editor-in-chief he was criticized for his bitter polemics. He wrote on October 14, 1842, to his friend, the Catholic leader of Nancy, M. de Dumast: "I am here tormented by loafers and worry-warts who are afraid of work and of fresh air, and who tell me constantly that I am doing great harm to religion. These people irritate me and make me perhaps overshoot the mark, just because they want to hold me back. Approval incites me less than criticism, and I have the fault of not being able to stand those heroes of the night who are never willing to approve frontal attacks in the full light of day. Sincerely, am I wrong? Is Sainte-Beuve not odious?"[17]

Veuillot had joined the staff of the *Univers* after much trouble. This paper, founded in 1833 by Abbé Migne—universally known for his Patrology, and to his contemporaries for his inclination to found one enterprise after another—had not been very successful. For a time it seemed that financial difficulties would force its owners to accept government subsidies, which caused Veuillot to say that he would prefer the death of the paper to such a shame. A legitimist publication, *Union,* tried to swallow the *Univers,* but the fusion of these two organs with appeal to Catholics turned out in actuality to be a victory for the purely Catholic line of Veuillot, although he encountered resistance from some staff members.

---

[17] *Corr.,* I, 320.

But soon difficulties arose which again and again threatened his career as a Catholic journalist in the most serious way. His polemical methods were severely criticized by a leading representative of the hierarchy, Denys-Augustin Affre, Archbishop of Paris. Veuillot wrote to his confidant of this period, Foisset, on June 20, 1843:[18] "The Archbishop has invited me to dinner; he recommends moderation. His words permitted me to draw equally two conclusions: either I am obliged to be absolutely silent or I could continue, foregoing certain excesses. I have accepted the second course, though he was very manifestly for the first one." And Veuillot complains bitterly about the fact that only a few bishops were energetically fighting the anti-Catholic University, and that among the fighters there had been none appointed under the regime of Louis Philippe. He quotes Lacordaire, a leading contributor to Lamennais' *Avenir,* the paper whose basic ideas had been condemned in Gregory XVI's encyclical *Mirari vos:* "the episcopate appointed by the ministers of the Revolution is a condemned one." He defends the sentence in which he had compared the Church with an odalisque held in the harem of the government. "What does the Government want to make of the Church? An agency of the police and a blessing-machine under the direction of a choir of bishops without virility." In a letter to de Foblant of August 8, 1843,[19] he complained about bishops supporting the University, and in a letter to Ourliac written on September 5, 1843[20] in the abbey of Dom Guéranger at Solesmes, he proclaimed that only laymen can obtain the freedom of education necessary for the Church.

Veuillot regarded himself as a Catholic journalist who could not rely upon leadership by bishops inclined to avoid public conflicts and dependent too much upon the government. This attitude made him a representative of the Catholic movement which had arisen during the Restoration under the leadership of de Lamennais. This fact is emphasized in the biography of his brother, despite Lamennais' break with the Church in 1834.[21] The Concordat of 1801 had re-established the organization of the Church, but the subsequent Napoleonic policy had put it under strict control by the state. The organic articles attached, in a unilateral way without negotiations with the Pope, to the concordat by Napoleon reserved for the religiously indifferent government all the rights of control and supervision which extreme Gallicanism had claimed for the French Catholic kings and parliaments. Under the Restoration the situation did not change basically, at least according to Lamennais.[22] This priest without any office, a simple religious writer, had become famous in 1817 for his attack against all kinds of indifferentism. He appeared first as an extreme supporter of royalism. He expected a religious renewal with the help of the government. But soon his attitude began to change. As a violent opponent of Gallicanism and a proponent of ultramontanism, advocating concentration of the supreme Church authority without any limitations in the hands of the Pope, he turned against the moderately Gallican regime of the Bourbon kings. He fought bitterly their educational policy which was directed by Monseigneur Denis de Frayssinous, titular Bishop of Hermopolis, in his capacity as Minister of Public Worship, who had highly praised his book of 1817. Influenced by the Belgian example, he finally recommended an alliance between the Church and liberal movements.

---

[18] *Corr.,* I, 385 ff.

[19] *Corr.,* I, 397 ff., ". . . je vois les Evêques supporter l'Université, les laïques ne songe qu'à leur pot-bouille . . . cette jeunesse qui n'a rien à faire et qui se met a entretenir les pauvres parce que cela coûte moins que les filles."

[20] *Corr.,* I, 412. A few days earlier in a letter of August 25, Veuillot had described the danger of the University for Catholics: ". . . l'éducation est irreligieuse." And he remarks that the Archbishop of Paris is angry about those who have not spoken with the same restraint as he has done. I, 409 ff.

This development found a spectacular expression in 1830 after the collapse of the Bourbon regime, which had been announced in advance by Lamennais. In his newspaper *Avenir,* Lamennais proclaimed an alliance between the Papacy and the people. The Church ought no longer to rely on any support from the State; the freedoms of society, i.e., freedom of education, opinion, association, and the fight for social justice are necessary for the realization of the social and religious mission of the Church. This program was presented with the help of abstract formulas which betray a limitless confidence in the victory of truth as a result of discussion and in the goodness of the people whose progress is prevented only by external, superannuated, and egoistic authorities. Despite his emphasis upon papal authority Lamennais seemed to claim uncautiously for himself the right to determine Church policies—unaware of existing conditions which the Pope was obliged to take into account. He had also developed a religious philosophy which did not distinguish clearly between reason and revelation. The editors of *Avenir,* forced by financial difficulties to cease publication, travelled to Rome to obtain an approval of their views by the Pope. But the encyclical *Mirari vos,* published after the three pilgrims of "God and Liberty" had left Rome, brought their public condemnation. Internal doubts and merciless persecution by his triumphant enemies resulted in Lamennais' defection from the Church. But none of his friends and disciples followed him.

---

[21] *E.V.,* I, chapters XIV-XV. Louis Veuillot refused to print attacks against Lamennais, writing: "Nous ne pouvons oublier que M. de Lamennais a rendu à la religion d'immenses services; il a eu le premier toutes les idées que nous défendons; il a fait la brèche par où nous essayons de passer." (Letter to Carrière of May 2, 1846, *Corr.,* II, 174 ff.). The latest survey of the Catholic movement is given in Dansette, *op. cit.,* with a bibliographical notice. Cf. also my book *Ideen,* quoted in note 1.

[22] For the literature on Lamennais cf. F. Duine, *Essai de bibliographie de F. R. de Lamennais* (Paris, 1923). Important publications since 1923 are mentioned in my article "Lamennais," *Review of Politics,* IX (April, 1947), 205-229.

The ideas of his Catholic period continued, however, to be influential even after he himself had repudiated them by his breaking away. Those who for a time had regarded him as their leader and inspirer—a biographer has characterized him as exercising a "dictatorship in the Church of France"[23]—retained the belief that the Church cannot rely, as many bishops continued to hold, on understandings and compromises with the government or on hopes that the old regime of the Restoration, with its alliance between the throne and the altar, would return. Dom Guéranger founded the Benedictine Abbey of Solesmes and fought victoriously against attempts of the local bishop, Jean-Baptiste Bouvier of Le Mans, to control him. Lacordaire re-established the Dominicans in France and impressed the young generation and unbelievers by his conferences of Notre Dame. Catholic newspapers and journals were founded; charitable activities under Catholic auspices were organized through the Conferences of Vincent de Paul in which Ozanam played a leading role. Lamennais had succeeded in making some French Catholics realize that the future of the Church depended upon the activities of Catholics in society and not upon deals and compromises between the hierarchy and an agnostic, sceptical government. This belief became, as a lasting consequence of his activity, identified with the rejection of the Gallicanism widespread in the French hierarchy and with an emphasis upon the authority of the Pope.

---

[23] F. Duine, *Lamennais* (Paris, 1922) entitles book II, 59 ff., "Une dictature dans l'Eglise."

Gallicanism had become discredited because in the nineteenth century it was utilized by regimes which, like the Restoration, did not understand the times (trying to return to a doomed past, favoring the aristocracy dethroned by the Revolution) or which were manifestly sceptical and indifferent, if not directly hostile, to religion like the regime of Napoleon and that of the Bourgeois king. The Catholic movement continued, even after the condemnation of the *Avenir* and Lamennais' downfall. During the first years after Veuillot's conversion it found expression in the fight for freedom of education against the University's (i.e., the State's) monopoly of the higher learning. It was characteristic that primary education had been organized satisfactorily for the Church by Guizot at the beginning of Louis Philippe's rule.[24] The dominant liberal bourgeoisie was not opposed to maintaining the influence of the Church among the masses of the people—Voltaire had cynically said that religion was necessary for the protection of the *coffre-forts*[25]—but it was opposed to the possible influence of the non-authorized congregations, particularly the Jesuits, upon the formation of the ruling classes.

Veuillot became one of the most radical denouncers of the University, which he castigated as atheistic. He attacked it mercilessly in his open letter to its principal defender, the minister Villemain, and he went to prison for a month for his energetic support of Abbé Combalot who had been condemned for his abuse of the University. Some bishops supported the war against the University; but many did not especially like the public attacks, for they had been satisfied by concessions made to their little seminaries; they were impressed, too, by the complaints of moderate Catholic supporters of the regime. Cautious Gallican prelates like Archbishop Affre of

---

[24] H. Guillemin, *Histoire des catholiques français au XIX^e^ siècle* (Paris, 1947), pp. 92 ff. Guillemin quotes also Tocqueville (*Correspondance inédite,* II, 48) who writes about the changing mood in 1834: "La plupart des libéraux que les passions anti-religieuses avaient jadis poussés à la tête de l'opposition tiennent maintenant un language tout différent de celui qu'ils tenaient alors. Tous reconnaissent l'utilité pratique d'une religion."

[25] Cf. A. Mathiez, *La révolution et l'église* (Paris, 1910), pp. 7 ff.

Paris regretted the activities of Catholic laymen, of journalists like Veuillot and of parliamentary leaders like Montalembert, a peer of France, who as a friend of Lamennais had, during the *Avenir* period, opened a Catholic school without legal permission, testing the principle of freedom of education contained in the charter.[26] These bishops believed that they had to settle all questions of interest to the Church by more or less discreet negotiations with the government.[27] They did not like those of their colleagues who in public statements supported the Catholic laymen, claimed that the principles of liberty contained as a necessary logical consequence freedom for the Church, particularly in the field of education, and pointed out that the freedom of education was stated in the charter, the written constitution of the regime.

The bishop who during the 1840's developed in the last years of Louis Philippe's rule in a series of publications a system justifying the appeal to general liberties in order to help the Church and lay activity in her behalf, particularly that of journalists, was Monseigneur Pierre Parisis,[28] Bishop of Langres (later on of Arras), who had close relations with the leading editor of the *Univers*. Veuillot, the ultramontane fighter for the rights and freedoms of the Church, seemed at this time to co-operate, despite personal frictions, with the very Catholics against whom he was later to conduct bitter and violent polemics. Montalembert was accepted by him as the leader of the "parti catholique," fighting against the University monopoly. Lacordaire he admired with the greatest enthusiasm. The antipathy he had from the beginning for Abbé Félix Dupanloup seemed to be a rather personal affair, although he criticized severely a pamphlet of the future Bishop of Orléans in which a compromise with the University was apparently proposed.[29] Montalembert first tried to deprive Veuillot of the control of the *Univers* in 1845 by putting above him a committee composed of Montalembert, Lacordaire, the Jesuit Ravignan, Abbé Dupanloup, and Lenormant, a Catholic professor of the University.[30] When it became clear that the members of this committee were unable to agree among themselves, a new editor-in-chief, de Coux was appointed, but Veuillot, apparently demoted to the rank of assistant editor-in-chief, remained the master of the *Univers.*

---

[26] Cf. *Lec.*, I, 229 ff. The school was opened by the "Agence génerale pour la défense de la liberté religieuse" formed by the *Avenir* group. Lacordaire participated in the action. As the school was closed, Montalembert declared that he had opened it "dans l'intention . . . de me conformer . . . à la Charte de 1830" (*Lec.*, I, 232).

[27] Guillemin, *op. cit.*, pp. 98 ff., gives quotations from the pamphlets "whose not very Christian language" was publicly regretted by the Archbishop of Paris. Veuillot supported these pamphlets and published a statement of the Bishop of Chartres, whose metropolitan the Archbishop of Paris was, praising Abbé des Garets, who had publicly rejected the censure of Archbishop Affre.

[28] Cf. *Ideen*, pp. 162-166 (The works of Guillemant and Follioley about Parisis are quoted, p. 364).

These conflicts caused much bitterness, but they seem not to have been produced by basic differences. Montalembert did not like to be censored by Veuillot, whereas Veuillot complained that Montalembert could not contain his temper, was inclined to offensive criticism, and surprisingly found the *Univers* sometimes not sharp and aggressive enough.[31] All crises were overcome, although the resulting tensions ended the beautiful time of Catholic unity during which, as Lacordaire put it, "all the world embraced each other and Jesuits dined at the Dominicans."[32] Many found Veuillot's attacks too bitter, his language too abusive, and his irony too devastating. But the conflict between himself and the democratic Catholics developed only after the February revolution of 1848, and the abyss separating him from the liberal Catholics reached its depth only after Louis Napoleon's coup d'état in 1851. In order to understand the differences between Veuillot and the friends of an understanding with democracy such as Lacordaire and Ozanam, such liberal Catholics as Bishop Dupanloup, Montalembert, and Foisset, and such representatives of the hierarchy as Archbishop Marie Dominique Sibour of Paris, it is necessary to disentangle the various elements which appear in the innumerable conflicts characteristic of the career of the great Catholic publicist.[33] Through all the conflicts, despite the purely nominal functioning of de Coux as editor-in-chief from 1845-1848, Veuillot remained the leading spirit of the *Univers* until the breakdown of his health in 1878 ended his public activities.

---

[29] *Mél.,* II, 516, article of March 13, 1847: "L'auteur [Dupanloup] s'est laissé aveuglé par sa propre droiture, il a trop cedé à ce penchant si noble qui le porte à penser et à dire du bien de tout le monde et plus particulièrement de ses adversaires, au milieu desquels l'aménité de son caractère lui a fait tant d'amis." In a letter to du Lac of November 10, 1846, Veuillot has complained that Dupanloup spread in Rome Montalembert's harsh sentence: *"L'Univers* est la honte du catholicisme" (*Corr.,* II, 213). On Bishop Parisis' dislike of Dupanloup, cf. *Ideen,* p. 183.

[30] Cf. *E.V.,* II, 12 ff.; II, 230 ff.; *Corr.,* II, 110 ff. Letter to Foisset of January 5, 1845. Cf. also the letter of Veuillot to Montalembert of November 11, 1846, which is most important for the understanding of the relations between the Catholic leader and the Catholic journalist (*Corr.,* II, 214-220).

[31] *Corr.,* II, 111: "Montalembert a voulu nous entrainer contre la *Gazette de France,* organe légitimiste, qu'il nous félicite maintenant de n'avoir pas entamées; il a voulu nous faire attaquer nominativement certains évêques."

[32] Dansette, *op. cit.,* p. 330, quotes Lacordaire's letter to Mme. Swetechine of June, 1844: "Aujourd'hui, tout le monde s'embrasse, les évêques parlent de liberté et de droit commun. . . . Les Jésuites dinent chez les Dominicains. . . ."

Veuillot shared originally with Montalembert, the disciple and former friend of Lamennais, his anti-Gallican and ultramontanist attitude. This ultramontanism was the basis of his powerful influence in the Church of France. He obtained the enthusiastic support and unlimited admiration not only of some ultramontanist prelates like Louis Cardinal Pie of Poitiers and Thomas Cardinal Gousset of Rheims who opposed the attempts of Veuillot's opponents in the hierarchy such as Bishop Dupanloup of Orléans and Archbishop Sibour of Paris to silence him, but also what was particularly important, of the lower clergy.[34] The parish priests were often dissatisfied with their treatment at the hands of bishops. Their complaints were in several cases supported by Rome, which rejected Gallican practices denying to priests guarantees based upon canon law and opposing their appeals to the Pope.[35] The parish priests, particularly those in the country, admired the merciless open attacks of Veuillot against everyone he regarded as an enemy of the Church, without any respect for social and intellectual prestige, as exemplary proofs of his courageous, unshakeable loyalty to the Church of Christ. They had little if any understanding of complicated maneuvers, deals, and compromises and of intellectual discussions. Veuillot spoke for them if he castigated the spirit of the men who frequented the salons and influential circles of agnostics and unbelievers.

---

[33] Some particularly important conflicts were: In 1848-1849 with the *Ere Nouvelle* which had been founded with the participation of Lacordaire and Ozanam, and was supported by Archbishop Affre; with the supporters of the Falloux Law in 1849 among whom were Dupanloup and Montalembert; with Archbishop Sibour of Paris who tried vainly to destroy the influence of the *Univers* in 1850; in 1853 Sibour took the side of Abbé Gaduel who had attacked Veuillot for his support of the allegedly unorthodox Spanish writer, Donoso Cortes, and in 1856 the archbishop supported the anti-Veuillot pamphlet, "L'Univers jugé par lui même"; with Dupanloup, particularly in 1852 when the Bishop of Orléans tried to organize a collective condemnation by the French hierarchy of Veuillot's attitude in the polemic about the use of pagan classics in Catholic education, and in 1869 when he published a public warning to Veuillot; with the liberal Catholics of the *Correspondant*, particularly since 1855. These polemics are described briefly in Weill, *op. cit.*, and in Dansette, *op. cit.*, with many details in *E.V.* and *Lec.* For the study of Veuillot's views *Mél.* and *Corr.* are indispensable.

[34] J. B. Duroselle writes in his as yet unpublished book, Les débuts du Catholicisme social en France jusqu'en 1870" (Paris, Presses Universitaires): "l'impitoyable Veuillot . . . attaquait sans merci aux applaudissements de la majorité du clergé tous ceux qui osaient s'éloigner de ses conceptions."

Veuillot succeeded in winning his battles with his episcopal adversaries—whose actions were often not supported by Montelambert, despite his friendship with Bishop Dupanloup—because Pope Pius IX was on his side. The attitude of the Pontiff caused Sibour to withdraw a public censure directed in 1853 against Veuillot's *Univers.*[36] Veuillot became, in his refusal to accept episcopal condemnation—although he carefully avoided acts of public opposition—the spokesman of the Catholic laymen who, acting for the interests of the Papacy, felt that they had the right to continue to fight for the Church, even if they had to antagonize some bishops.

The episcopal opponents of Veuillot regarded his attitude as a usurpation of that authority which belongs to the hierarchy. Bishop Dupanloup condemned Veuillot's support of Abbé Gaumes' campaign to eliminate the influence in Christian education of pagan classic writers. Dupanloup claimed that Veuillot had no right to determine what should be taught in Catholic schools. However, his attempt to silence Veuillot through a collective declaration of the bishops against him collapsed because influential members of the hierarchy would not give their signatures. Bishop Parisis came out publicly for the

---

[35] Jean Maurain, *La politique ecclésiastique du second Empire de 1852 a 1869* (Paris, 1930), pp. 31 ff.: "Le droit coutumier français avait pour caractère essentiel la toute puissance des évêques. La tradition d'après laquelle les décisions des congrégations romaines n'avaient pas en France force de loi assurait leur indépendence vis à vis de la cour de Rome. . . . Contrairement aux règlés établies par le Concile de Trente ils nommaient, déplaçaient et révoquaient à leur gré les membres du bas clergé."

[36] Before the publication of the encyclical *Inter multiplices* of March 21, 1853, in which the Pope recommended the defense of good papers, the Secretary of Latin briefs of Pius IX, Monsignor Domenico Fioramonti had written to Veuillot a letter full of praise for his work. *E.V.*, II, 554.

Univers.[37] Archbishop Sibour supported a campaign which tried to prove that Veuillot was ignorant of theological questions and that he praised and published unorthodox writings of the Spanish lay theologian, Donoso Cortes, with whom Veuillot shared an antipathy against the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie had been characterized by the Spaniard as a class so occupied with eternal discussions that it could not accept truth. This polemic resulted in some very satirical attacks of Veuillot against a kind of theology which quotes authorities without understanding the issues.[38] Sibour condemned Veuillot's polemics, which he found too brutal and harmful to the Church, whereas Veuillot had no confidence in the pusillanimity of those bishops who dared not take courageous actions and use direct, open language.

In the period before 1848 Montalembert had agreed with Veuillot's dislike of compromises and transactions between governments and Church authorities. He had regretted the compromise reached between Rome and the government of Louis Philippe in 1845 concerning the Jesuits; they had become the main targets of anti-clerical attacks which embarrassed the cabinet of Guizot. The General of the Society of Jesus issued an order which seemed to dissolve the Jesuit houses in France, but which in practice had rather an opposite effect.[39] Montalembert, who later became a particularly bitter enemy of Veuillot, co-operated with him, despite all personal disagreements, until 1852. Particularly, he shared Veuillot's rejection of Ozanam's and Lacordaire's attempts to reconcile Catholics with the democracy which had come to power in the first months after the February revolution of 1848. Montalembert regarded the threat of socialism as a decisive one and he opposed—as Veuillot did also—Ozanam's and Lacordaire's *Ere Nouvelle*.[40] True, in 1850, a conflict of Veuillot with Montalembert resulted in the end of the "parti catholique," which had fought against the University monopoly; it was caused by Veuillot's attitude towards the Falloux law.[41] By this law, Falloux, the friend of Montalembert and Dupanloup, as Minister of Education, succeeded in enacting a reorganization of the University. This legislation made possible the opening of Catholic colleges, even those conducted by religious orders, including the Jesuits. Falloux skillfully utilized the fear of the liberal leader Thiers who, under Louis Philippe, had been a bitter opponent of the "parti catholique" and a violent enemy of the Jesuits, and who was now obsessed by a haunting fear of a threatening social revolution. Falloux arranged the decisive commission preparing the law in such a way that Thiers

---

[37] *Corr.*, III, 371, letter to Abbé Bernier of July 4, 1852: "La lettre inespérée et nonsollicitée de l'évêque d'Arras a fait merveille quant à nous." Cf. also *E.V.*, II, 503 ff.

[38] *Mél.*, V. 344 ff., "De la Presse religieuse laïque," a series of articles attacking Abbé Gaduel, the enemy of Donoso Cortes: "Il [Donoso Cortes] désavouera les erreurs plus vite que certains théologiens de profession—qui avaient pourtant lu Witasse—n'ont récemment désavoué leurs livres condamnés plus haut. M. l'abbé Gaduel reconnaitra ce petit mérite à ces indiscrets laïques." On Donoso Cortés cf. E. Schramm, *Donoso Cortés su vida y su pensamiento* (Madrid, 1936) and Carl Schmitt, *Donoso Cortes in gesamteuropaischer Interpretation* (Köln, 1950).

[39] Dansette, *op. cit.*, p. 331, and Guillemin, *op. cit.*, p. 102. The government announced that the Jesuits had ceased to exist in France, whereas only a re-

---

organization of their houses took place. Some Catholic leaders, among them Lacordaire and de Coux, were opposed to an energetic defense of the Jesuits.

[40] Cf. Thomas P. Neill, "Louis Veuillot and the February Revolution," *Historical Bulletin*, XXVIII (May, 1950), 75-76; 82-87. The *Ere Nouvelle* was violently criticized by the *Correspondant* which supported Falloux and Montalembert (Guillemin, *op. cit.*, pp. 152, 152). "Montalembert . . . avait trouvé pour Ozanam et les siens un joyeux sobriquet, il les appelait des libérâtres." (Guillemin, *op. cit.*, p. 207). The Catholics moved, abandoning a first period of enthusiasm for democracy after the February revolution, to the conservative right, in conformity with the general public opinion. Dupanloup's *Ami de la religion* and Veuillot's *Univers* started to attack the *Ere nouvelle*. As Montalembert, Veuillot emphasized that the return to the belief in God alone can protect property. Cf. Laflon, *L'église de France et la révolution de 1848* (Paris, 1948), 86 ff., 116 ff.

[41] About Falloux and his law. Cf. *Ideen*, pp. 198-210; Henri Michel, *La loi Falloux* (Paris, 1906); Dansette, *op. cit.*, pp. 363 ff., "Grâce à la loi Falloux (l'Eglise) a pu gagner au catholicisme une importante partie de la bourgeoisie. Et pourtant de nombreux catholiques, Veuillot en tête, repoussent la loi parce qu'elle n'accorde pas à l'Eglise une liberté totale" (p. 369). Guillemin, *op. cit.*, 227, writes that the law of Falloux "concerne en vérité beaucoup moins l'enseignement que la sécurité sociale." Cf. Louis Veuillot's *Réponse à M. le comte de Falloux: Le parti Catholique* (Paris, 1856). Veuillot emphasizes that Bishop Parisis did not vote for the law, "Il en repoussait le principe où il voyait la domination de l'Etat sur l'Eglise en matiere d'enseignement" (72 f.). Veuillot wrote on June 26, 1841, to de Dumast: "Voilà une loi de M. de Falloux qui n'est point bonne et que nous allons combattre," (*Corr.*, III, 55) and August 2, 1849, to Louis Rendu, Bishop of Annecy: "Je suis désolé surtout de l'attitude de M. de Montalembert. M. de Falloux m'a moins surpris. Quoique chrétien plein de ferveur il n'a jamais été précisement un des nôtres, et que nous appellons un catholique avant tout" (*Corr.*, III, 61). On the attitude of the bishops to the Falloux law cf. Veuillot's letter to Dominique Dufeltre, Bishop of Nevers, *Corr.*, III, 105 ff., in which he defends his opposition against the Falloux legislation.

was faced not by the inflexible Bishop Parisis and Veuillot, but by the skillful negotiator and *homme du monde,* Dupanloup. It is characteristic that Thiers was willing even to accept stipulations practically permitting the educational activities of the Jesuits, although he said cynically that he would hide under the table during the debates. Veuillot regarded the Falloux law as a betrayal because the monopoly of the University in higher education was not formally abolished and because it retained some supervisory and accrediting functions. Nor was he satisfied by the introduction of Church authorities into its councils. The Falloux legislation brought into the open his dislike of the tactician and skillful negotiator behind the scenes, Falloux. The times were forever past in which Veuillot could call on Falloux and be received with the declaration of Falloux's little daughter that he, Lacordaire, and Montalembert were the good Catholics.[42] But the definite break with Montalembert occurred later, in 1852, as a result of the bitter excoriation by the *Univers* of Montalembert's refusal to co-operate with the regime of Louis Napoleon after the coup d'état.

Montalembert had at first supported the coup d'état, although he was critical of the abolition of the constitution and the disbanding of the National Assembly. But then he turned definitely against the new regime.[43] In his pamphlet on the *Catholic Interests in the Nineteenth Century* he pointed out that Catholic successes in the last decades had been accomplished by appeals to general liberties. In reply, Veuillot launched upon an unrestrained polemic against Montalembert. The editor of the *Univers* emphasized in his letters that Montalembert's reversal was effected by his capitulation to opinions circulated widely in the salons and he pointed out the changes in the attitude of the Catholic leader.

---

[42] Cf. the footnote of Eugène Veuillot to a letter of his brother in October, 1843. In this letter it is said: "M. de Falloux est un catholique; c'est tout dire" (*Corr.,* I, 425).

[43] *Lec.,* III, chapter I, describes how Montalembert was somewhat critical of the coup d'état; but then he advised the Catholics in an article in the *Univers* of December 12 to vote for Louis Napoleon in the plebiscite: "Je ne vois hors de lui que le gouffre béant du socialisme vainqueur. Mon choix est fait. Je suis pour la société contre le socialisme," III, 39. Cf. also Maurain, *op. cit.,* pp. 3 ff. Veuillot had written on December 5: "Il n'y a ni à choisir, ni à recriminer, ni à déliberér. Il faut soutenir le gouvernement. Sa cause est celle de l'ordre social."

This accusation was impressive; for it cannot be denied that Montalembert's break with Louis Napoleon was a break with his own policies after 1848. Even Lacordaire had turned during these years against his old friend because he was not willing to accept the policy of the "parti de l'ordre."[44] Montalembert had joined this party, in which the fear of socialism dominated everything, and he was ready to accept a strong authority in order to smash the threatening socialist revolution. Only after the coup d'état when it was too late, Montalembert realized that Louis Napoleon's policy had been aiming at dictatorship. He was now profoundly shocked by the flouting of legal order demonstrated by the confiscation of the possessions held by the members of the Orléans family. He became the champion of the liberties of a parliamentary regime now abolished in France. For Veuillot liberties in themselves had no meaning, although he had himself appealed to them, as his adversaries pointed out again, in demanding them in the interest of the Church. His old dislike of bourgeois institutions had rather increased after 1848. He became more and more convinced that they were of no use and that parliamentarians were only men of vanity who enjoyed their own speeches. In his articles against Montalembert's *Catholic Interests in the Nineteenth Century* he wrote about the brilliant Catholic parliamentary leader that he "believes himself to be a liberal, but in truth he is only an orator."[45] Veuillot showed in his letters, despite all praise in public, some scepticism about Louis Napoleon, but this did not prevent him from supporting with great energy the regime of the coup d'état. What did it matter that the liberties of the parliamentary world were abolished? What mattered was only the liberty of the Church, and Veuillot believed that this liberty was now secured.

Louis Napoleon was very eager to gain Catholic support and he delivered speeches in which he posed as a Christian ruler.[46] Orders were given to officials to behave correspondingly and the navy was officially put under the patronage of the Blessed Virgin. Skillfully the man of the coup d'état gave the impression that the Organic Articles of Napoleon—which were used to control the Church and had never been recognized by Rome—would be abolished just as the University monopoly had been modified and that an obligatory character of the Sunday observation, requested by Catholics, would be introduced. Although he had demanded in a letter to Ney (in 1849) political reforms in the Papal States which were rejected by Pius IX, he was anxious to maintain the best of relations with Rome. Negotiations over a coronation of the emperor by the Pope dragged on endlessly until it became clear that they could not succeed, for the Second Empire was unable to grant the abolition of the Organic Articles demanded by Pope Pius IX. Despite the attempts to maintain Gallican claims, the regime appealed to Rome in order to settle conflicts with bishops whose behavior was regarded as unacceptable; there were some legitimist bishops who did not assume the expected attitude of enthusiastic support of the regime. But in general the bishops were satisfied with the new Constantine, as Napoleon was sometimes called. They forgot their past and this was particularly spectacular in such cases as those of Archbishop Louis de Salines of Amiens and Bishop Olympe Gerbet of Perpignan who had been friends and collaborators of Lamennais.

---

[44] Lacordaire wrote in a letter of September 7, 1850: "Je vous écris de l'hôtel où en 1831 je logeais à Gènes avec M. de la Mennais et Montalembert. Les trois pélerins, hélas, se sont bien divisés et ils ne se retrouveront plus sous le même toit." *Lettres à Madame la Comtesse de la Tour du Pin* (Paris, 1866), quoted in *Ideen*, p. 377.

[45] *Mél.*, V, 265-279. Veuillot writes: "Un grand nombre d'idées fausses se cachent sous les mots vagues de système parlementaire et de liberté. Ces idées sont contraires aux principes, par conséquent aux intérêts catholiques" (p. 271).

[46] Maurain, *op. cit.*, pp. 40 ff. On October 9, 1852, Louis Napoleon stated in

Veuillot's *Univers* supported the regime. The liberties which had been abolished appeared to Veuillot to be of concern only to the bourgeois, liberal world and to those who regretted former regimes, and who, if they were Catholics, were not above all Catholics; for they had a political axe to grind; they were legitimists like Dupanloup who did not see how the liberty of the Church was now better realized than ever before, and who would have liked to replace the *Univers* with its purely religious attitude by papers interested in political aims.

Veuillot's basic attitude can be characterized as political indifferentism. Napoleon represented a strong power, maintaining order and respecting the Church. This appeared to Veuillot, it seems, as a realization of his first program for the *Univers,* expressed in the

---

Bordeaux: "Je veux conquérir à la religion, à la morale, à l'aisance cette partie encore si nombreuse de la population qui au milieu d'un pays de foi et de croyances connait à peine les précepts du Christ."

slogan "God and the fatherland." The man of the people regarded the bourgeois society as condemned and doomed; an apocalyptic attitude entered into Veuillot's contempt for all those who believed in constitutions, parliamentary practices, and debates. Only God and His Church matter.[47] The Church maintains the true natural, social, and moral order. The society established after the Revolution hastens towards its ruin. Veuillot defended in the history of the Church without restraint what the liberals attacked most violently, e.g., the Inquisition. This attitude was criticized not only by liberal lay Catholic leaders, but also by such members of the hierarchy as Archbishop Sibour.[48]

But did he not prevent conversions by such methods? Veuillot did not care. He was for the full truth. He would not attract people by refusing to tell disagreeable things; he would shout the absolute truth; he would defend the Church as she is—without treacherously attempting to reconcile her with a world of corruption, decay, and evil. The Pope was for maintaining temporal power; therefore, all complicated discussions of the relations between unified Italy and the Papal States appeared as superfluous and as proofs of an un-Catholic attitude.

The liberal Catholics whose organ after 1855 was the *Correspondant,*[49] regarded Veuillot's attitude as one which was doing tremendous harm to the Church. Their representative in the hierarchy, Bishop Dupanloup, emphasized this again and again. They disliked the brutal polemical methods of Veuillot; they were too well bred for this sort of thing, for they were men of wealth and education and were elected to the French Academy which became a center of a practically harmless opposition to the Second Empire. Their hostility toward the *Univers* did not mean, of course, that they were not against the enemies of the Church or that they tried to compromise with them as Veuillot implied. They defended the papal temporal power.[50] Dupanloup fought with all his energy Littré's admission to the Academy. But they made distinctions, such as Montalembert's in his famous addresses at Mechlen in Belgium, and Dupanloup's in his interpretation of the *Syllabus.* There is an unlimited wrong liberty which is license, but there are liberties, realized in English parliamentary institutions, which Montalembert admired and which can be accepted by Catholics as deriving from the Christian spirit. There is the ideal society with only *one* cult, the Catholic cult, the "thesis," and the modern society with liberty of worship, the "hypothesis." Veuillot's flouting of liberties, his enthusiasm for the regime of the strong man, of the alliance between the priest and the soldier[51] which made France great and which was resurrected in the Second Empire, appeared to these liberal Catholics as cynicism which would put the Church in an embarrassing position. The Church would be accused of demanding liberties as long as she was not in power, liberties that she denied to others when she had come into power. That is the view which has often been ascribed to Veuillot, although Lecanuet, the biographer of Montalembert, admits that Veuillot did not formulate it directly and explicitly. Sometimes the fronts change in a strange manner. For example, Bishop Dupanloup used his authority in attempts to suppress the *Univers;* Veuillot rejected, in the name of his rights, the misuse of authority as, according to him, it was manifested, e.g., in the public warning of Dupanloup in 1869.

---

[47] Cf. *Ideen,* pp. 210-238 ff. After being disappointed by the Second Empire Veuillot dreamed about a direct alliance between the Papacy and the peoples. In a letter to the Marquise de M.... of April 15, 1861, Veuillot remarks, "Dieu rejetant les rois donne mission à son Eglise d'organiser la démocratie" (*Corr.,* VII, 2). And in an article of July 14, 1868, he proclaims his belief in a universal federation presided over by the Pope in a holy and baptized democracy.

[48] The statement of Archbishop Sibour in 1850 accused Veuillot of having defended "without charity and right doctrine" the authenticity of the miracles of Rimini. *Corr.,* III, 198. Letter to Bernier. Cf. *E.V.*, II, 402. The archbishop criticized also the lack of prudence shown in Veuillot's fight for the Inquisition.

[49] Cf. Weill, *op. cit.,* and *Lec.,* III.

There can be no doubt that Veuillot's claim to be a Catholic above all was sincere and did not cover up a cowardly subservience to a strong regime. That was shown by the fate which the *Univers* suffered when Napoleon III embarked upon a policy permitting the reduction of the Papal States. Despite official warnings, the *Univers* published in 1860 a papal encyclical of protest and was suppressed. In the *Odeurs de Paris,* Veuillot described this suppression: "Six years ago a Catholic paper, having been warned for its attacks against the Organic Articles, for its attacks against the Army, for its attacks against foreign nations, was finally suppressed on the grounds that it did harm to the Catholic religion by not presenting it under a sufficiently favorable light."[52] And in his conflicts with the bishops Veuillot always tried, as he believed, to avoid policies which would challenge the authority of their office. If he opposed Dupanloup he did it because he knew that he had the supreme authority of the Church on his side. He did not regard it as an attack against episcopal authority if he wrote with irony about the Bishop of Orléans' reception in the Academy. The decisions of Rome he was willing to accept without any hesitation as, e.g., his attitude demonstrates after Rome declared itself for the application of the Falloux law. The *Univers* stopped immediately its polemic against a law which it had regarded not as an acceptable compromise, but as a betrayal. Veuillot was a sincere ultramontanist who was proud to enjoy the sympathies of Pius IX and to be regarded as the publicist fighting for papal infallibility. The decision of the Vatican Council was for him a confirmation of his old faith. He did not understand the hesitations of those who had opposed it or regarded it as inopportune.

---

[50] Maurain, *op. cit.*, pp. 360 ff. [Cardinal] "Antonelli chargea le nonce de féliciter au nom du pape . . . Falloux, Montalembert . . . pour avoir défendu de leur plume le pouvoir temporel" (p. 362).

[51] For a description of Veuillot's attitude during the Crimean War cf. *E.V.*, III, 22 ff. An article of Veuillot was reproduced in the official *Moniteur* upon personal order of Napoleon III.

Montalembert, whose fighting temper had in the final period of his life caused him to withdraw even from the *Correspondant,* in his last article published in the monarchist-Gallican *Gazette de France* on March 7, 1870, shortly before he died, castigated the ultramontanists' "sacrificing justice and truth, reason and history to the idol which they have erected for themselves in the Vatican."[53] His polemic with Veuillot and his defense of liberties had resulted in his taking an attitude apparently opposed to the ultramontanism he had professed since his youth.

The Vatican Council marked the peak of Veuillot's influence. After 1870 he remained an influential journalist who now advocated the restoration of the Catholic legitimate monarchy represented by the last Bourbon, the Duke of Chambord, with his lily banner. He continued to fight the liberal Catholics and he wrote many articles against their conspiracy which he thought was proved by an inscription made on the wall of Montalembert's chateau in 1862.[54] But he had not the old influence, even though his hold on the lower clergy continued to be great despite a letter from Pius IX, which although it praised him, confirmed some accusations of his enemies by regretting his "zèle amer."[55] After 1879 he was only nominally editor-in-chief of the *Univers*. Illness prevented him from writing; when Cardinal Pie, who had supported him as the ultramontanist antagonist of the liberal Dupanloup, died, he was unable to write a necrology and the twenty lines which he composed on this occasion were so poor that they have not been reprinted in his *Oeuvres Complètes.* Until his death in 1883 one could observe him moving about his apartment, incapable of doing any work, only saying the rosary, a proof that he retained the faith won in 1838 until the end. After his death the *Univers* was continued under the leadership of his brother Eugène. But some of its editors left in 1893 and, inspired by Louis Veuillot's sister Elise, established a new organ, *La Vérité Française*. They were not willing to follow the advice of Leo XIII and accept the Republic.

---

[52] *Oeuv. div.*, XI, 22 ff.

[53] Weill, *op. cit.*, p. 183. In *Lec.*, III, 465 ff., 469 ff., the reaction of Pope Pius IX is described.

[54] In this inscription the fight "pro Ecclesia libera in patria libera" is men-

The disagreements about Louis Veuillot have not ceased even at the present time. Paul Claudel[56] has celebrated him as the Maccabean of modern Catholicism, the fearless fighter for the Church in a cowardly world, whereas the most recent history of French Catholicism since the Revolution, that of A. Dansette, speaks about his malevolent influence. But Veuillot the writer is recognized by the enemies as well as the friends of his views. Sainte-Beuve, whom Veuillot disliked intensely, expressed his admiration for the observer, literary critic, and stylist Veuillot,[57] although he wrote in 1861, at a time when Veuillot had not yet published his masterpiece, *Odeurs de Paris*. And Jules Lemaitre[58] paved the way for an understanding of the kindness and profound sincerity of the polemicist who was merciless in his fights against those whom he regarded as the enemies of the truth, precisely because he was a man with strong, uncompli-

---

tioned. *Lec.*, III, 332. Veuillot remarked with sarcasm in 1873: "Ces bourgeois font un marbre à propos de leur communion privée" (*E.V.*, IV, 524).

[55] Quoted in *E.V.*, IV, 347.

[56] Paul Claudel wrote the preface of F. Veuillot's biography of Louis Veuillot (Paris, n.d.).

[57] Sainte-Beuve, *op. cit.*, p. 115, recognizes that besides many unjust strictures there are in Veuillot's works many judgments "fermes, sagaces, bien frappés."

[58] Jules Lemaitre, *Les contemporains: Etudes et portraits littéraires,* Sixième Série (Paris, 1898).

cated feelings. For him everyone was an enemy who appeared to him too cautious and prudent or as capable of compromises and transactions.

Louis Veuillot sacrificed his life to journalistic activities. He had emphasized that the journalist cannot be a writer, i.e., the author of carefully planned, thoughtfully prepared, and meticulously formulated books. True, he was a man of astonishing facility. He wrote in addition to his innumerable articles many books—and this work was accomplished not only between 1860 and 1867, that is during the years when the Second Empire had forced upon him an involuntary leave from daily journalistic labor. But his books, too, have a journalistic, impressionistic character.

They excel in sharp, concise formulations, in a clarity and verve of presentation which carries the reader away and prevents him from stopping in order to realize the complexity of the issues. Surprising formulas always keep interest alive, despite the repetition of comparatively few basic slogans and the steady reappearance of the same likes and dislikes. The impression which Veuillot made was based upon his capacity to make his cause appear self-evident and superior to all its enemies and detractors. Veuillot reversed the weapons used by anti-Catholic publicists against the Church. The enemies of the Church were put on the defensive, made to appear stupid, full of ignorant prejudices and deserving only of irony which was for Veuillot a form of violent, moral indignation.

Veuillot's readers were not introduced to problems and difficulties; solutions were imposed upon them. These solutions were based on simple, sincere beliefs, on a spiritual, but at the same time truly human, experience. The pathos of Veuillot is not unctuous, artificial, a product of the brain, but the result of his certainty that he is defending a holy cause, the sacred cause of God and His Church. Surely he was an oversimplifier, but not a dishonest man, not an ambitious man anxious for his personal power, not a vain man trying to impose his ideas, but a man who believed himself to be acting as a humble and obedient son for God and His Church. This belief made him ruthless, merciless, bitter, and inclined to see everywhere forces of evil at work. Despite all his capacities for sharp observation, there are only two colors for Veuillot, black and white. That makes him somewhat monotonous—the tone of his voice does not change. There are no smiles, no abandonments to lighter moods, at least in public affairs. Even in his private life Veuillot tends to be an austere moralist despite occasional relaxation and his tender love for family idylls and warmth. The obedient believer opposes the Church to modern society; particularly despicable are Catholics who are impressed by its salons, liberties, pseudo-learning, superficial vanities, and optimistic beliefs. There can be no paradise and true happiness on earth; Veuillot is inclined to apocalyptic visions although they often become vague and general. For him the Church is the true city and society and she will not die with the post-revolutionary bourgeois world which ridiculously believes itself to be superior to the Church and her people.

A man with such basic attitudes was surely incapable of understanding policies of accommodation and prudence. He was also unable to realize that for many persons a simple, unreflecting faith predominant in societies in which objective traditions prevail over individual consciousness, was no longer possible. Veuillot, the man of the easy and prompt conversion, the extraordinarily gifted son of the people, was not aware of doubts and hesitations, nor did he believe in the necessity of finding new and personal solutions. His lack of interest in philosophy and problems was supported and, to some extent, justified by the fact that fideistic attitudes, confusing revelation and reason, were widespread in his time. He read and admired de Maistre, de Bonald, and Donoso Cortés and he lived before the Thomistic renaissance inaugurated by Leo XIII.

But despite the limitations of his basic approaches, his obsession with issues of the day and his inclination to overrate them, his tendency too easily to see eternity where only a noisy actuality appears, Veuillot must be regarded as an important figure in the development of modern Catholicism.

This counter-revolutionary remains against his will and consciousness the son of the world after the French Revolution. He represents the demand of laymen for the right to serve the Church as her loyal sons but at the same time as masters of their own actions. He realizes the importance of public opinion; he rejects, and not only for personal reasons, episcopal projects to edit a Catholic organ under supervision of the bishops which would necessarily become colorless and too cautious. The Catholic publicist, inspired by Catholic faith but acting on his own initiative and responsibility, is his ideal. This publicist does not accept undeserved and humiliating criticism by churchmen, as Veuillot's behavior had demonstrated and that not only in the case of Bishop Dupanloup.

Veuillot is proud of his courage and independence, and this pride helps him to apply a new method of defending the rights and liberties of the Church. Negotiations between the government and the authorities of the Church are replaced, or at least accompanied, by campaigns to influence public opinion. The success of the *Univers* with the clergy and with some bishops who undo again and again the efforts of several of their colleagues to control, or even to destroy this too independent organ, and particularly the backing by Rome—despite some criticism of Veuillot's methods—preserved it from the fate of Lamennais' *Avenir*. Veuillot's career as the most influential French Catholic publicist was a long one, but not a meteoric one, as that of the first powerful exponent of ultramontanism in nineteenth-century France. His gifts as a publicist were far superior to those of his opponents as well as his friends.

His tendency to see everywhere only black and white brought him popularity, particularly among the parish priests who did not understand transactions, accommodations, and diplomatic silences. But precisely this popularity created the danger—pointed out by his critics—of making him the leader of a faction or a clique in the Church more powerful than the hierarchical authorities. It has been said that priests refused to become bishops in order to avoid attacks by Veuillot. And Veuillot, the leader of a Catholic faction, was inclined to take a purely negative, incensed or—even worse—bitterly satirical attitude to the problems and difficulties of modern society, although his own power was based upon the freedom of public discussion and press. But he did not appreciate his dependence upon liberal society. He also did not realize that his negative or apparently indifferent attitude towards all purely political questions—he judged regimes according to their Church policies of the moment—covered up political decisions which were not exclusively dictated by religious faith. He was inclined to put his trust in a strong power during the first years after Louis Napoleon's coup d'état; he believed in the possibility of restoring a monarchical-patriarchal regime after 1871. And even his social Catholicism, his understanding of the needs of the masses, his rejection of the harsh punishment of the Communards after 1871, his support of the bold request of Gaspard Mermillod, Bishop of Lausanne, preaching before a socialite audience, to render justice to the poor and not to be satisfied with charity,[59] does not display an understanding of the rising industrial society. He may often appear more perspicacious than those liberal Catholics who could not imagine that their world of discussion would one day become obsolete, that a disgust with belief in progress and civilization would develop. But he himself was too much linked up, although as a bitter denouncer, with the society of his opponents. He accompanied it as the negative shadow and as its merciless and untiring enemy. That makes many of his furies and indignations appear today to have been provoked by very ephemeral and too superficial issues.

Still it would be wrong to criticize him for his limitation, for even the liberal Catholics could not foresee what solution would be found by the Papacy of the twentieth century for the temporal power of the Church. Veuillot could not anticipate that the excessive belief in progress and science would be widely replaced in our time by a despair resulting from the experience of irrational, uncontrollable forces. But there is no doubt that his inclination to regard himself as the spokesman for Catholicism, above all deepened disagreements among Catholics. Even Pius IX who had much sympathy for Veuillot and very little for his opponents, and who saw in the editor of the *Univers* a defender of causes particularly dear to him, reprimanded him for his polemical methods which were alien to Catholic charity.[60]

His Catholicism was a mixture of an admirable, unbroken faith in the divine character and mission of the Church, of personal views, and the particular temper of a fierce, independent spirit. The anti-bourgeois, anti-liberal Catholicism of Veuillot, the son of the people, who never forgave the guilt of liberal society for depriving the masses of religion and Christian social justice, as much as the Catholicism of Lacordaire, Dupanloup, and Montalembert is one of the innumerable possibilities of expressing the Catholic faith. Both

---

[59] *E.V.*, III, 568 ff. But Veuillot had attacked Melun in 1848 when this Catholic leader demanded social legislation. Veuillot wrote that the charity work of the Church would suffer by such legislation. [Melun, *Mémoires* (Paris, 1894), I, 265.]

[60] Quoted in *E.V.*, IV. The Pope regrets "la manière de combattre et les censures personnelles qui bien que parfois inévitables se recontrent dans vos écrits plus fréquemment qu'il ne convient."

Veuillot and his enemies belonged to a world determined by the experience of the French Revolution and both tried to utilize the liberties of the post-revolutionary society for the Church. Veuillot tried to return to a fully Catholic society in which the Catholic faith alone would matter as a basis for liberty and human dignity. His opponents realized that this return was impossible; they believed that the survival and activity of Catholics in a modern society without organized spiritual unity mattered more than all crusades against dissenters, heretics, and enemies. They appeared to Veuillot as half-Catholics, compromising with non- or anti-Catholic modern trends, as sly diplomats and politicians; whereas in their eyes Veuillot was a shortsighted fanatic who identified his visions with the faith and his indignations and prejudices with the cause of the Church. Ozanam said about Veuillot that he did not try to make converts, for he liked too much to offend those who did not share the faith. Veuillot despised his Catholic opponents because they tended although unconsciously, as he believed, to become converted by the non-Catholic world and to sacrifice the Church to society. In Veuillot perfectionist enthusiasm for which only the more religious faith and, perhaps, even more the destruction of all the enemies of the Church, are of real consequence, contends with a prudent attitude which sees first the needs and demands of its age. By this antagonism eternally recurring types are expressed.

This fact makes Veuillot an important figure, and not only for those who are concerned with conflicts in the history of nineteenth-century Catholicism. Veuillot is not the representative of a cowardly, submissive attitude, a strong power hypocritically praising the Church, a reactionary fanatic who is happy to renounce independent thinking and to abuse those who refuse to follow him. He is a fierce fighter for what he believes to be the truth and salvation for the individual, as well as for the world. Even if he tried to impose solutions which were too easy, Veuillot emerges for those who try to look behind the mask of his impatience and fury a sincere Christian personality. He expresses his unshakeable conviction that the Church of Christ and His vicar is the way, the truth, and the life; he leads the good fight in the service of the institution which for him represents God on earth. As an honest, untiring crusader he fought mercilessly—his opponents claimed, brutally—everyone he suspected of hampering his holy cause. He is not aware of what he endangers or destroys in order to reach his aim. But can he be reproached for that?

His shortcomings correspond to a time for which polemics and policies mattered more than the development of theology and Christian philosophy. It is the admirable simplicity of Veuillot's faith and loyalty to the Church and her supreme head here on earth which establishes the limits of his activities. The strength given him by his unshakeable conviction that he must always defend the Church is at the same time his weakness—he is unable to distinguish between his personal cause and the cause of Christ. His bitterness, therefore, hurts more than his emotional outbursts. This bitterness, absolutely sure of itself, appears to be rendering judgments inspired by God. Imperceptibly to himself, Veuillot tended to forget that he was not the master but the servant of the Cause to which he had dedicated his life from the time of his early conversion.

University of Notre Dame

A CONCILIAR THEORY OF THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY

By

BRIAN TIERNEY*

It is nearly seventy years since Gierke wrote: "Too little attention has hitherto been paid to the influence on political theory of the work done by the Legists and Canonists."[1] Nevertheless there remains something of a penumbra over that area of mediaeval thought where juristic concepts and political theories interpenetrated and profoundly modified one another. Some further investigation of this area of thought seems especially desirable as a preliminary to any adequate analysis of the origins of the various theories on Church government put forward in the fourteenth century.

The most original of these theories, that of Marsilius of Padua, rested on a radical re-statement of the mediaeval doctrine that all lawful political authority should be based on the consent of the governed. For Marsilius, the governing body of a state, which he calls the *pars principans*, is a mere 'executive instrument,' established by the whole body of the citizens, and subject to correction if it transgresses the laws laid down by the *civium universitas*.[2] The idea that ultimate authority in any society must rest with the whole body of its members was again a fundamental element in the thought of other well-known publicists such as John of Paris[3] and William of Occam,[4] and in the writings of the conciliarist authors at the end of the fourteenth century.

---

* Mr. Tierney is a research student at Pembroke College, University of Cambridge.

[1] Otto Gierke, *Political Theories of the Middle Age* translated by F. W. Maitland (Cambridge, reprint, 1938), p. 101, n. 1.

[2] Marsilius, *Defensor pacis* ed. C. W. Prévité-Orton (Cambridge, 1928), I, 12, 49; I, 15, 68; I, 18, 96.

[3] John of Paris maintained that the dominion of church property was vested in the whole Church as a corporate body, and that the Pope controlled it merely as *dispensator*. So, too, spiritual authority ultimately rested with the whole Church, and only a general council was competent to define articles of faith. Cf. his *De potestate regia et papali* in Goldast's *Monarchia*, ii, 113, 139. Cf. also R. Scholz, *Die Publizistick zur Zeit Philipps des Schönen und Bonifaz VIII* (Stuttgart, 1903), pp. 275-333; S. Riezler, *Die literarischen Widersacher der Päpste zur Zeit Ludwig des Baier* (Leipzig, 1874), p. 145, and especially J. Rivière *Le problème de l'église et de l'état au temps de Philippe le Bel* (Paris, 1926), pp. 281-300.

[4] On the political thought of Occam cf. E. F. Jacob, *Essays in the Conciliar*

Since, however, the conciliarists were not concerned to destroy the whole substance of papal authority, but rather to reform the Papacy and to re-establish it as a center of Christian unity, the theories of Church government they evolved were more moderate in tone than those of Marsilius. They usually recognized the divine origin of papal authority but nevertheless held that, since the Roman Church was only one member of the body of the Church Universal, it was subject in the last resort to a general council representing the whole community of the faithful.[5] The Church, as a *societas perfecta,* could not be without the means of curing its own disorders even if this involved taking action against the Pope himself. Moreover, since the conciliarists were especially interested in the reform of the papal curia, they were frequently led to consider the constitutional position of the cardinals, and writers like Gerson and D'Ailly advocated for the Church a "mixed constitution" in which Pope, cardinals, and general council should all play a part.[6]

Ideas such as these have often been presented as a growth typical of the fourteenth century, a reaction against the excessive papal centralization of the preceding hundred years, and a reflection in the ecclesiastical sphere of the constitutional experiments that had been taking place in various countries. Rivière wrote of John of Paris that, in claiming for a general council superiority over the Pope in the definition of articles of faith, "il s'écartait par là de la grande tradition théologique et canonique du moyen âge où la *determinatio fidei* fut unaniment réservée au pape en dernier ressort."[7] And Figgis main-

---

Epoch (Manchester, 1943, pp. 85-106; C. C. Bayley, "Pivotal Concepts in the Political Philosophy of William of Ockham," *Journal of the History of Ideas,* X (1949), 199-218; M. A. Shepard, "William of Occam and the Higher Law," *American Political Science Review,* XXVI (1932), 1005-1023, and *ibid.,* XXVII (1933), 24-39.

[5] Cf., e.g., Dietrich of Niem, *De modis* ed. K. Heimpel, (Leipzig, 1933), p. 15 and Gerson *Opera* ed. E. du Pin (Antwerpiae, 1706), II, 205. Occam had expressed the same thought at the beginning of the fourteenth century, *Dialogus* V, 24 (in Goldast's *Monarchia* II, 494).

[6] Cf. D'ailly *De ecclesiae et cardinalium auctoritate* in Gerson, *Opera,* II, 946.

[7] Rivière, *op. cit.,* p. 298. In fact, on this point John of Paris was following closely the opinion of Johannes Teutonicus who composed the *glossa ordinaria* to the *Decretum* c. 1215 [J. F. v. Schulte, *Die Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts* (Stuttgart, 1887), I, 172-175]. Cf. gloss *ad*

tained that the decree setting forth the claims of the Council of Constance was "the most revolutionary document in the history of the world." [8]

Yet in fact very many of the characteristic ideas of the fourteenth-century publicists had already been put forward, analyzed, and even defended by the canonists of the preceding century. The fact that these writers consistently supported the extreme claims of the Papacy as against the Empire has led perhaps to an undue neglect of the subtleties of their thought where purely internal problems of Church government were concerned. Indeed, one of the most distinguished of all the thirteenth-century canonists not only put forward a theory of the structure of corporations that seems to have a close affinity with the political ideas of Marsilius, well over a half a century later, but also showed how this theory could be made the basis of a coherent system of Church government in which one may well detect the germs of the later conciliarist theories.

This was Hostiensis (Henricus de Segusio), known as "iuris utriusque monarcha, Subalpinae regionis splendor." [9] He studied Roman and canon law at Bologna, lectured at Paris, and then spent some time in England as adviser to Henry III.[10] He was sent by this king on an embassy to Innocent IV and subsequently became chaplain to the Pope, and then in turn Bishop of Sisteron, Archbishop of Embrun, and Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia and Velletri (1261). He died in 1271.[11]

Dist. 19, c. 9, *s.v.* 'Concilio': "Videtur ergo quod Papa tenetur requirere concilium episcoporum quod verum est ubi de fide agitur, et tunc synodus maior est Papa."

[8] N. Figgis, *From Gerson to Grotius* 2nd ed. (Cambridge, 1916). p. 34.

[9] Franciscus Balbus, quoted in G. Panciroli, *De claris legum interpretibus* (Lipsiae, 1721), p. 420.

[10] F. W. Maitland, *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* (London, 1898), p. 115, referring to Matthew Paris, *Chronica Majora* (Rolls), IV, 33, 286, 351, 353.

[11] Schulte *op. cit.*, II, 123-129, C. Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica* (Monasterii, 1913), I, 8, "Ex claris juris pontificii scriptoribus," in *Jus Pontificium,* VIII (1928), 91-96, and A. van Hove, *Prolegomena in Codicem Juris Canonici,* 2nd ed. (Malines, 1945), pp. 476-477. There is some doubt as to the exact date of Hostiensis' death. *Jus Pontificium, loc. cit.,* gives the date as November 6, 1271, but Schulte, Eubel, and van Hove say that he died October 25, 1271. Eubel gives the date of his cardinalate as May, 1262, but the other authorities cited all give it as 1261. The works upon which the great fame of Hostiensis rested were the *Summa titulorum* (called *Summa aurea),* composed between

It is especially interesting to trace in Hostiensis' work the roots of some of the conciliar ideas of the next century since he has been regarded usually as an extreme papalist, typical of the canonists of Innocent IV's generation. And certainly, in discussing the relations of spiritual and temporal power, he put forward far-reaching claims for the Papacy. It is his account of the distribution of authority within the Church, and the theory of corporations upon which that account is based, that are of interest for the present enquiry. It will be convenient to consider first his views on the structure of corporations and the relationship between these views and the ideas of Marsilius, and then to describe the system of Church government that Hostiensis erected on the basis of this theory of corporations.

I

Hostiensis and the *pars principans* of Marsilius.

Marsilius is the most enigmatic, as he is the most original of the fourteenth-century publicists. He has been described as "the prophet of modern times . . . the most modern of mediaeval thinkers,"[12] and also as "a product of his age, a mediaeval Aristotelian."[13] Different scholars have found in his work the seeds of Hobbesian absolutism, the first stirrings of democratic radicalism, or merely an expression of "the normal judgment and practice of the Middle Age . . . the assertion of traditional principles."[14] The presentation of his theory is indeed such as to leave the way open for differences of interpretation. He holds that ultimate authority in any society should rest with a *legislator* comprising all its members, and that the will of this *legislator* is accordingly expressed by the *civium universitas,* or, when there is not unanimity, by its *valentior pars.* The *pars principans* is established by the *legislator,* which it represents *quasi instrumentalis vel executiva,* and its function is to regulate the civil and political

---

1250 and 1253 (cf. S. Kuttner, "Decretalistica"; *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, Kanonistiche Abteilung,* XVI [1937], 461), and the *Lectura,* finished between June, 1270, and April, 1271, (cf. S. Kuttner, "Wer war der Dekretalist Abbas Antiquus?" *ibid.,* p. 468, n. 3).

[12] C. W. Prévité-Orton, "Marsiglio of Padua," *English Historical Review,* XXXVIII (1923), 1-18, and especially p. 2.

[13] A. P. D'Entrèves, *The Mediaeval Contribution to Political Thought* (Oxford, 1939), p. 87.

[14] R. W. and A. J. Carlyle, *A History of Mediaeval Political Theory in the West* (London, 1936), VI, 9.

activities of the citizens in accordance with the fundamental laws laid down by the *legislator*.[15] If the *pars principans* itself transgresses these laws it is subject to correction and even to deposition.[16]

In considering the form of the *pars principans* Marsilius follows closely the classification of Aristotle, and seems to prefer a system of limited monarchy,[17] a conclusion commonplace enough. It has been suggested, therefore, that the novelty of his position lies, *inter alia,* in the creation of his abstract theory concerning the structure of the State, in his definition of a necessary relationship that should exist between the *pars principans* and the *legislator* whatever the particular form of government adopted.[18] Yet it is precisely in his account of this relationship that Marsilius seems most tantalizingly reticent. The *pars principans* is one of the six 'parts' which together make up the *civium universitas,* and so presumably must have some say, together with the other 'parts,' in shaping the decisions of the *legislator*. Those decisions are in practice to be determined by the *pars valentior* of the community, and it is now generally agreed that Marsilius intended the quality of the citizens to be taken into account as well as their numbers in estimating the *pars valentior*.[19] But he offers no explanation as to how their quality is to be assessed,[20] and, in particular, no account of the weight to be attached to the opinions of the *pars principans,* considered for the moment as a constituent part of the *civium universitas* as well as its executive agent. This point seems of fundamental importance for determining whether Marsilius' thought can be described as, in any real sense, 'democratic' in temper.

---

[15] Marsilius, *op. cit.,* I, 12, 49, and I, 15, 68.

[16] *Ibid.,* I, 18, 96.

[17] *Ibid.,* I, 8, 28.

[18] A. P. D'Entrèves, *op. cit.,* p. 55, referring to Gierke. On Marsilius' conception of the relationship between *pars principans* and *legislator* cf. G. de Lagarde, *La naissance de l'esprit laïque au declin du moyen âge* (Paris, 1934), II, 183-189.

[19] Marsilius, *op. cit.,* I, 12, 49: "Valentiorem inquam partem considerata quantitate personarum et qualitate in communitate."

[20] Marsilius' concept of the *pars valentior* is much more akin to the *maior et sanior pars* of a cathedral chapter required in episcopal elections (e.g., *Decretales,* I, 6, 22; I, 6, 29; I, 6, 57), than to the modern idea of a merely numerical majority. Marsilius was also typically mediaeval in leaving the meaning of his phrase *pars valentior* somewhat vague, for the canonists never worked out a precise definition of their term, *pars sanior.* Cf. A. Esmein, "L'unanimité et la majorité dans les élections canoniques," *Mélanges Fitting* (Montpellier, 1907-1908), I, 355-382. The resemblance between canonistic theory and the ideas of Marsilius on this important matter has often been pointed out. Cf. H. Rehm, *Geschichte der Staatsrechtswissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 190-191, C. H. McIlwain, *The Growth of Political Thought in the West* (New York, 1932), p. 303; G. de Lagarde, *op. cit.,* II, 196, and W. Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism* (London, 1948), pp. 197-198.

Since, however, it is at least clear that Marsilius "is not thinking in terms of modern individualism . . . but has in mind the *populus* as a mediaeval *universitas,"* [21] it is possible that an analysis of some earlier mediaeval ideas on the structure of a *universitas* may contribute to the understanding of his thought.

In the thirteenth century it was natural that the canonists should be particularly interested in the analysis of the structure and essence of corporations, since many of their day-to-day problems dealt with the affairs of corporate bodies—such problems, for instance, as the definition of the powers of a chapter during an episcopal vacancy, the determination of whether a sentence of excommunication could be valid against a corporation, the investigation of the precise obligations implied by the relationship between a bishop as *caput* and his canons as *membra* of one *universitas.* Moreover, once an adequate theory had been evolved to deal with such matters, there arose the possibility that it might be applied to the *universitas* comprising the whole Church, thus providing a new basis for theories of ecclesiastical government.[22]

Already in the *Commentaria* of Innocent IV there are hints of such an approach. When he makes use of the standard imagery depicting the whole Church as a *corpus* the word has begun to acquire a technical flavor,[23] and he does not hesitate to apply the language of corporation law to the Pope himself.[24] But the theory of the structure of corporations that Innocent put forward was simply that all the powers of a corporation resided in its rector:

---

[21] McIlwain, *op. cit.,* p. 303.

[22] The description of the Church as a single organism, a mystical body of which Christ was Head, is as old as St. Paul (Ephesians 4). The earlier mediaeval publicists were content to use the concept as a piece of anthropomorphic imagery along with other allegories that sought to depict the unity-in-diversity that was believed to characterize the Church. Gierke, *op. cit.,* p. 103 n. 7, gives numerous references. It was left for the canonists to elaborate the concept into a formal legal doctrine by applying to the Church the rules that Roman law suggested for governing the affairs of other corporations.

[23] Innocent IV, *Commentaria super libros quinque decretalium* (Francofurti, 1570), II, 12, 4, fol. 222, col. 1.

> . . . est notandum quod rectores assumpti ab universitatibus habent jurisdictionem, et non ipsae universitates. Aliqui tamen dicunt quod ipsae universitates, deficientibus rectoribus, possunt exercere jurisdictionem . . . quod non credo.[25]

Thus, he could view with equanimity the application of the rules governing the affairs of corporations to all levels of Church government, while at the same time making the most extreme claims for papal supremacy.

Hostiensis adopted a more subtle view of the structure of corporations. He cites the opinion of Innocent quoted above, and then explicitly rejects it, ". . . quod reprobat verius est, licet difficilius."[26] For Hostiensis the authority of a corporation resides in all its parts, and, if the head is lacking, the jurisdiction of the whole devolves to the members: "Sede vacante jurisdictio penes capitulum residet, sicut universitas, sicut collegium licitum"[27]—or to such of them as survive.[28] When a corporation has a rector, he indeed has the exercise of its jurisdiction,[29] but not by his own virtue. Rather he is to be regarded as a proctor acting on behalf of the whole corporation: ". . . praelatus sit procurator generalis ad negotia . . . et liberam administrationem videatur habere."[30]

The expressions *procurator generalis ad negotia* and *libera administratio* are technical terms which define the precise degree of authority committed to a prelate by the corporation of which he is head.[31] A

---

[24] Innocent IV, *op. cit.*, I, 35, 4, fol. 161, col. 4: "Publica persona est papa."

[25] Innocent IV, *op. cit.*, I, 2, 8, fol. 4.

[26] Hostiensis, *Lectura in quinque decretalium Gregorianarum libros* (Parisiis, 1512), I, 2, 8, fol. 7, col. 2.

[27] Hostiensis, *Summa aurea super titulis decretalium* (Coloniae, 1612), *De officio ordinarii*, col. 299, n. 3.

[28] *Summa, loc. cit.*, "Mortuo ergo praelato et etiam mortuis omnibus de capitulo excepto uno jus totius corporis, cujus praelatus caput est et canonici membra, in ipsum recidit et per ipsum retinetur."

[29] *Summa, loc. cit.*, ". . . sede autem instituta habet exercitium praelatus."

[30] *Summa, De his quae fiunt ab episcopo*, col. 800, n. 1. Cf. also *De treuga et pace*, col. 317, n. 6, ". . . . si dicatur episcopus pater est tamen procurator," and *De procuratoribus*, col. 337, n. 1, ". . . episcopus dominus non est sed procurator."

[31] For an analysis of the significance of the terms *libera administratio* and *plena potestas* in the mandates of mediaeval proctors, cf. Gaines Post, "Plena potestas and Consent in Mediaeval Assemblies," *Traditio*, I (1943), 355-408, especially 356-364.

procurator generalis ad negotia was appointed, not merely for some particular case, but with authority to act in any suits that might arise during his proctorship, and Hostiensis adds that, in his view, such a general mandate empowers the proctor to act in administrative as well as purely judicial affairs.[32] There were, however, certain powers that a general mandate alone did not confer. For instance, it was necessary for a general proctor to obtain a special mandate from his principal to alienate property, to remit debts, or to 'transact' (i.e., to make a compromise agreement with the opposing party). But when the mandate for a general proctor was strengthened by the formula conceding to him *libera administratio,* he could do all these things without further reference to his principal.[33]

There was, however, one most important limitation to these extensive powers. No delegation of authority to a proctor could confer on him a right deliberately to act in a manner prejudicial to the interests of the corporation that he represented: "Per haec verba [liberam administrationem] non datur potestas male administrandi . . . bene datur potestas aliquid conferendi . . . sed non conceditur perdere . . . ergo nihil alienabit in ecclesiae detrimentum."[34] This was the normal doctrine of both civil and canon law. Moreover, when a principal doubted the good faith of his proctor, the powers of the proctor could be revoked.[35]

---

[32] *Lectura, De procuratoribus,* I, 38, 9, fol. 173, col. 4, ". . . quamvis lex videatur distinguere inter procuratorem ad judicia et negotia . . . tamen eo ipso quod alius ad tractandum omnia negotia constituitur procurator hanc potestatem habere videtur"

[33] *Lectura, loc. cit.*, "(procurator) non habet potestatem transigendi . . . nec pignus remittendi . . nec alienandi . . . nisi ei generalis et libera administratio sit concessa."

[34] *Lectura, De electione,* I, 6, 19, fol. 41, col. 2.

[35] *Lectura, De procuratoribus,* I, 38, 4, fol. 171, col. 3, ". . . in tali casu potest procurator indistincti revocari." Cf. also *Summa, De his quae fiunt ab episcopo,* col. 800, n. 1, ". . . praelatus nomine suo et capitulo . . . et agit et defendit . . . nisi contra ipsum orta sit suspicio."

This does not mean, though, that the canons alone could depose a bishop, which would be entirely contrary to canon law. The right to revoke a proctor's powers rests with the whole corporation. But the bishop himself is part of the corporation and the canons could not act in such an important matter without his approval. Therefore, a deadlock would result, and it would be necessary to refer the case to higher authority. Special difficulties would arise if it were desired to prefer charges against the Pope himself, since there was no individual superior to whom his case could be referred. Hostiensis' treatment of this problem is discussed below.

This idea of the prelate as proctor, which reappears in certain canonistic writings of the early fourteenth century,[36] seems closely akin to Marsilius' conception of the *pars principans* as the 'executive instrument' of the society which it governs. In the writings of Hostiensis there is even a verbal parallel, for in his *Lectura* he describes the prelate of an ecclesiastical corporation as the *principalis pars* of his church.[37] While, however, Marsilius showed himself particularly vague in defining the relationship between his *pars principans* and the whole *civium universitas,* Hostiensis embarked on a detailed analysis of the mutual obligations subsisting between a bishop, as the *principalis pars,* and the chapter over which he presides.

When a prelate acts on behalf of his church as proctor he exercises a wide but essentially derivative jurisdiction. In the theory of Hostiensis, however, a bishop is assigned a dual rôle. He is not only the proctor of his chapter but an integral part of it, with an important share in the shaping of its decisions: "Episcopus et canonici faciunt unum capitulum."[38]

The weight that the vote of a bishop carries in the deliberations of his chapter depends upon the type of business being discussed. When the matter is one that concerns the canons alone the bishop has a voice *ut canonicus,* but his vote is only equal to that of each of the other canons.[39] When, however, the matter is one that concerns the whole corporation, affecting both bishop and canons, he sits in the chapter *ut praelatus,*[40] and then his voice is "pregnans et auctoritabilis." Indeed, in these circumstances the vote of the bishop is considered as equal to those of all the canons together, so that the canons cannot act without the approval of the bishop, nor the bishop without the consent of the canons.[41] Joannes Andreae attributed to Hostiensis the view that, since the vote of the bishop was equal to those of all the canons, the bishop with one canon would form a clear majority for any business;[42] but Hostiensis makes it clear that he accepts this view only in those cases where a bishop is consulting his canons on a matter that belongs by law to his personal jurisdiction.[43] Where the well-being of the whole corporation is at stake he cannot proceed without the consent of all the canons or at least of their *maior et sanior pars.*

---

[36] Cf. Guido de Baysio (the 'Archdeacon'), *Super Sexto decretalium commentaria* (Venetiis, 1577), II, 10, 2, fol. 66, col. 3, and Joannes Monachus, *Glosa aurea super sexto decretalium* (Parisiis, 1535), glosses *ad* II, 14, 3, fol. 222, and *ad De regulis juris,* fol. 442. Guido's commentary was composed between 1298 and 1304 (J. F. v. Schulte, *Quellen,* II, 188) and the gloss of Joannes Monachus probably in 1308 (J. F. v. Schulte, *Quellen,* II, 192, but cf. also W. Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism,* p. 205, n. 3.)

[37] *Lectura, De his quae fiunt a prelato,* III, 10, 4, fol. 44, col. 3, ". . . ergo prelatus est principalis pars ecclesiae."

[38] *Lectura, De excessibus prelatorum,* V, 31, 1, fol. 70, col. 2.

[39] *Lectura, De excessibus prelatorum, loc. cit.,* ". . . quando habet vocem tanquam canonicus consideratur vox sua singularis tanquam canonici, quando vero ut prelatus, consideratur pregnans et auctoritabilis."

[40] *Lectura, De concessione prebendae,* III, 8, 15, fol. 41, col. 4, ". . . hoc est de jure communi quo ad communes tractatus habendos in his quae ad episcopum et capitulum pertinent communiter quod episcopus habeat vocem in capitulo tanquam prelatus, unde in talibus unus nihil debet facere sine reliquo."

Hostiensis approaches this same question from a somewhat different point of view in several discussions of the significance of the terms *de consilio* and *de consensu.* Two decretals of Alexander III, included in the *Gregoriana,* laid down that in conducting the affairs of his church a bishop should not proceed without the 'counsel' of his canons.[44] It was therefore necessary for the canonists to determine how far this necessity for consultation limited the freedom of action of a bishop in cases where he disagreed with his chapter. The general conclusion of Hostiensis is that, although a prelate is bound by law to seek the advice of his chapter, he is not always legally bound to accept the advice tendered. Some writers, he remarks, regard *de consilio* and *de consensu* as identical terms, but for himself he rejects any such interpretation.[45] He holds that the affairs in which actual consent is required cannot be defined precisely, since this depends partly on the customs of individual churches, and "in diversis ecclesiis diversae sunt consuetudines."[46] But in discussing the subject of alienations he arrives at the general principle that consent should be required normally in cases where the actions of a prelate might injure the interests of his church: "Quia si praelatus sine consensu capituli alienare posset, onerosum et periculosum esset ecclesiis."[47] The situation in this case is the same as that considered above when a prelate sits in chapter *ut praelatus* to consider a matter affecting the well-being of the whole corporation.

---

[41] *Lectura, De excessibus prelatorum,* V, 31, I, fol. 70, col. 2, ". . . in his in quibus episcopus habet vocem tanquam prelatus requiritur tam consensus episcopi quam capituli, ita quod unus sine reliquo nihil potest."

[42] Joannes Andreae, gloss *ad Sextus,* II, 15, 11.

[43] *Lectura, De concessione prebendae,* III, 8, 15, fol. 41, col. 1. ". . . quando episcopus vocem habet in capitulo ut prelatus solus episcopus tantam videtur habere vocem per se quantam omnes alii . . . idem in hoc casu dummodo habeat de capitulo secum duos vel unum saltem maiorem partem habet . . . sed et hoc intelligi debet quo ad collationes beneficiorum et institutiones de quibus loquuntur dicta capitula et alia quae de jure communi ad ipsum solum spectat, nam in alienationibus et similibus necesse est quod totum capitulum consentiat, vel maior et sanior pars ipsius." For Hostiensis the *maior et sanior pars* is always the more numerous part except where the less numerous part can bring forward and sustain a specific canonical objection against the opinion of the majority. Cf. *Lectura, De his quae fiunt a prelato,* III, 10, 5, fol. 45, col. 1.

[44] *Gregoriana,* III, 10, 1, and III, 10, 2.

It has been noted, however, that Hostiensis includes the right to alienate among the powers conferred upon a proctor who has received a mandate of *libera administratio*. He seems to take the view that, while a prelate cannot of his own authority alienate his church's property, he can act on behalf of the church in cases where loss of property might be involved without a special additional mandate. In putting forward this opinion he rejects the view of Bernardus Parmensis who had held, more consistently perhaps, that "qui non potest alienare non potest rem in judicium deducere."[48] Hostiensis, indeed, is disposed to allow to a prelate the greatest possible freedom of action in the normal conduct of day-to-day business. He understood very well that the restraints necessary to prevent abuses of power must not be allowed to hamper the operations of a governing body to such an extent as to destroy its effectiveness, and in this showed himself wiser than some of the theorists of the fourteenth century. Nevertheless, the most significant element in his analysis of the distribution of authority within a corporation is the conclusion that, from whatever point of view one regards the head of a corporation, whether in his rôle as prelate or as proctor, his office can never confer upon him any legal right to act on his own initiative in a manner prejudicial to the interests of his corporation.

---

[45] *Summa, De his quae fiunt ab episcopo*, col. 802, n. 1. Cf. also *Lectura, De arbitriis*, I, 43, 7, fol. 191, col. 4., *De his quae fiunt a prelato*, III, 10, 3, fol. 44, col. 3, III, 10, 4, fol. 44, col. 4, III, 10, 5, fol. 45, col. 1, and *De excessibus prelatorum*, V, 31, 1, fol. 70 col. 2.

[46] *Lectura, De his quae fiunt a prelato*, III, 10, 6, fol. 45, col. 3.

[47] *Lectura, De procuratoribus*, I, 38, 1, fol. 170, col. 1.

[48] Bernardus Parmensis, gloss *ad Gregoriana*, I, 38, 1, *s.v.* "legaliter." Bernardus composed the *glossa ordinaria* to the *Gregoriana* between 1234 and 1266. For dates of the various recensions cf. S. Kuttner and B. Smalley, "The Glossa Ordinaria to the Gregorian Decretals," *English Historical Review*, LX (1945), 97-105; also the late Van Hove, *op. cit.*, p. 473.

It seems clear that the resemblance between the *principalis pars* of Hostiensis and the *pars principans* of Marsilius is more than a merely verbal one. For Marsilius, as we have seen, the *pars principans* (or *pars judicalis*) exists to govern a society within the framework of laws established by the *universitas civium,* which it represents *quasi instrumentalis vel executiva.* Hostiensis defines the position of the *principalis pars* of a corporation as that of a proctor exercising judicial and administrative authority on behalf of the whole body. In both theories the powers of a ruler are restricted so as to prevent him acting against the interests of the community that he governs. Marsilius, however, was content to stress the subordination of the *pars principans* to the *legislator* without enquiring very closely into the relationship between them. Hostiensis, on the other hand, perhaps because he was expressing his thought in technical legal terms to which it was necessary to give a precise definition, was led to a detailed consideration of the relationship between the *principalis pars* and the rest of the corporation. When one considers the intricate analysis of all aspects of this relationship that Hostiensis undertakes, it seems not unreasonable to suggest that the obscurity of Marsilius on the subject arises, not so much from any 'astounding subtlety' in his thought, as from a tendency to excessive over-simplification.

II

Hostiensis on Church Government

The theory concerning the structure of corporations that has been outlined forms the basis of Hostiensis' approach to various problems of ecclesiastical authority. However, when one turns from considering the fundamental concepts upon which he based his theories to the actual details of his system of Church government, it is the writers of the conciliar age rather than the publicists of the generation of Marsilius whose views seem most in harmony with his own. The general attitude of Hostiensis is closely akin to that of moderate conciliarists like Gerson and D'Ailly who emphasized the rôle of the cardinals as an important element in the government of the Church, and who sought to defend the divinely instituted primacy of the See of Rome, while subjecting individual popes to the correction of a general council.

The system of Hostiensis rests on the basic principles that no office confers upon its holder the right to injure the corporation he represents, and that the members of a corporation lacking a rector are competent to exercise the jurisdiction of the corporation. A careful elaboration of all the implications of these two principles, when applied to the Roman See and to the Church as a whole, enables him to formulate solutions of several problems concerning the nature and limits of papal authority that had remained unresolved in the work of his predecessors.

Earlier canonists had especially shown hesitancy in defining the limits of papal authority where decisions on articles of faith were involved. On this point Gratian himself presented two quite divergent points of view without any attempt at reconciling them. Certain canons of the *Decretum* maintained that ultimate authority in matters of faith rested with the Apostolic See,[49] and that the Pope, as successor to St. Peter, was the supreme judge upon earth, and himself subject to the judgment of no one.[50] But it was also maintained in the *Decretum* that a Pope should not take important decisions in cases involving articles of faith, "sine concilio episcoporum vel presbyterorum et clerici cunctae ecclesiae Catholicae,"[51] and that the decisions of a general council in such matters must be preserved inviolate.[52] Moreover, whatever the hypothetical integrity of the See of Rome in matters of faith, it was clearly conceded that a Pope who was in fact a heretic should be accused of this crime and deposed.[53] If, therefore, the canonists were to construct a consistent system of Church government on the generally accepted premises of the time, it was necessary for them to evolve a theory of the structure of the Church which would recognize the divine origin of papal authority, while at the same time ensuring that any action of a Pope tending against the well-being of the Church, such as a promulgation of false doctrine, would be lacking in validity. A really comprehensive theory would also need to explain the relationship between Pope and cardinals on the one hand, and between the cardinals and the Universal Church on the other. All this was attempted in the system of Hostiensis.

---

[49] *Dist.* 11, c. 9. *Dist.* 17, c. 4, C. 24, q. 1. c. 11.

[50] *Dist.* 17, c. 6. *Dist.* 21, c. 7, C. 9, q. 3, c. 10-c. 18.

[51] *Dist.* 19, c. 9.

[52] *Dist.* 15, c. 2.

[53] *Dist.* 40, c. 6, "Huius culpas istic redarguere praesumit mortalium nullus . . . nisi deprehendatur a fide devius." The view that a heretical pope could be

He defines the whole Church as a *universitas* in both his *Summa* and *Lectura,*[54] and maintains that to this corporation as a whole God gave the power of binding and loosing and the gift of unerringness in matters of faith.[55] But, in conferring such priviliges on the Church, God also established within it a center of authority, the Papacy, which was to be *caput* of the *universitas fidelium*. In the view of Hostiensis, Peter bequeathed his headship of the whole Church, not to his successors personally, but to the Roman Church over which they presided:

> *Urbs ista* altera Jerusalem[56] intelligatur et effusione tui sanguinis qui primus meus vicarius es in terris fundetur, firmetur, et consecratur *hic locus* quem eligi mihi ut sic *haec ecclesia* sit caput et domina et princeps omnium ecclesiarum, non ab homine sed a me recipiens plenitudinem potestatis.[57]

This is illustrated by the fact that when the Pope dies the Church does not lack a head, since "Romana ecclesia . . . mori non potest." [58]

To reconcile the idea of a corporate headship of the Church with the fact that Peter was personally instituted vicar of Christ, a title which Hostiensis does not hesitate to apply to the Popes, he adopts a simple but effective line of argument. The Pope is Christ's vicar since he is Peter's successor. But he is Peter's successor precisely by virtue

---

tried and deposed was held by almost every canonist of note in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, e.g., by Rufinus, Stephanus Tornacensis, Bernardus Papiensis, Huguccio, Laurentius, Johannes Teutonicus, Bartholomaeus Brixensis, Goffredus Tranensis, Bernardus Parmensis, Innocentius IV. Cf. J. F. v. Schulte, *Die Stellung der Concilien, Päpste, und Bischöfe* (Prague, 1871), pp. 253-286, and V. Martin, "Comment s'est formée la doctrine de la supériorité du concile sur le pape,"*Revue des Sciences Religieuses,* XVII (1937), 121-143.

[54] *Summa, De schismaticis,* col. 1370, n. 1. ". . . schisma est illicita divisio . . . ab universitate ecclesiae." *Lectura, De sacra unctione,* I, 15, 1, fol. 103, col. 2, "Ecclesia est multitudo fidelium sive universitas Christianorum." Cf. Gratian, *De consecratione, Dist.* 1, c. 8, and C. 24, q. 1, c. 18, and also Marsilius, *op. cit.,* II, 2, 17, "Dicitur hoc nomen ecclesia . . . de universitate fidelium credentium et invocantium nomen Christi."

[55] *Summa, De decimis et primitiis,* col. 974, n. 15. ". . . nec enim ecclesia universalis errare potest . . .", and *De remissionibus,* col. 1659, n. 1.

[56] A strange reminiscence of the author of the *Tractatus Eboracensis,* who claimed that not Rome but Jerusalem should be "mother of all the churches." Cf. *Gitti (libelli de lite),* III, 659, 661.

[57] *Lectura, Qui filii sint legitimi,* IV, 17, 3, fol. 39, col. 1.

[58] *Lectura, De penitentiis et remissionibus,* V, 38, 14, fol. 102, col. 3.

of the fact that he is bishop of the Apostolic See;[59] and the holding of episcopal office necessarily implies a certain interdependence between the Pope as bishop and the other prelates who form the *membra* of the *universitas* of which he is *caput*. Hostiensis therefore asserts that the relationship between the Pope and the cardinals is exactly the same as that between any other bishop and his chapter,[60] a suggestion that has far-reaching implications.

Some clarification of the canonical status of the College of Cardinals was long overdue. The rise of the cardinals to a position of eminence in the affairs of the Universal Church can be traced back to the appointments of Leo IX, whose nominees, ardent champions of the reform movement from abroad, were hardly chosen "for the sake of the cardinals' hebdomadary functions."[61] The increasing importance of the cardinals was confirmed by Nicholas II's decree of 1059 on papal elections,[62] and during the next century it became normal for them to act as advisers in affairs of Church government, to share in the exercise of the judicial supremacy of the Roman See, and to countersign papal decrees.[63] Alexander III's election decree of 1179 reserved the right of making papal elections entirely to the cardinals by enacting that no *exceptio* could be brought against a candidate chosen by two-thirds of them.

---

[59] Thus Hostiensis argues that the designation of the cardinal-bishops, in the election decree of Nicholas II, to act as metropolitans during a vacancy in the See of Rome, confers on them papal authority, since a Metropolitan of Rome necessarily *is* Pope. Cf. *Lectura, De penitentiis et remissionibus,* V, 38, 14, fol, 102, col. 4.

[60] *Summa, De officio archipresbyteri,* col. 238, n. 2, and *Lectura, Qui filii sint legitimii,* IV, 17, 13, fol. 39, col. 1.

[61] S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis; the History of a Canonical Concept," *Traditio,* III (1945), 129-214, especially p. 173.

[62] Cf. A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (Leipzig, 1887), III, 683, n. 4., P. Hinschius, *Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken und Protestanten* (Berlin, 1869-97), I, 309-373, and A. Michel, *Papstwahl und Königsrecht* (Munich, 1936), pp. 345 ff.

The authority of the cardinals was augmented by the circumstances of the papal schism from 1080 to 1100, when the anti-Pope Clement found it to his advantage to strengthen their constitutional position. Cf. S. Kuttner, *art. cit.,* p. 174, and J. B. Sägmüller, *Die Thätigkeit und Stellung der Cardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII* (Freiburg, 1896), pp. 235 ff.

[63] J. B. Sägmüller, *op. cit.,* p. 216 f., H. Bresslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre,* 2nd ed., (Leipzig-Berlin, 1912-1931), II, 56-61, D. B. Zema, "The Houses of Tuscany and Pierlone in the Crisis of Rome," *Traditio,* II (1944), 160.

Except in the matter of papal elections, however, positive canon law was slow to concede any explicit recognition of this enhanced dignity of the Sacred College. Neither the canons of Gratian's *Decretum,* nor his *dicta,* nor the *glossa ordinaria* of Joannes Teutonicus contained any suggestion that the Pope's freedom to legislate was limited by the rights of the cardinals.[64] However, the *Gregoriana* included a letter of Innocent III, written in 1201,[65] which at last gave formal legal recognition to what had long been a matter of constitutional fact, that the proper function of the cardinals was to assist in managing the affairs of the Universal Church. Moreover, the use of the phrase "de consilio fratrum nostrorum" in several of the decrees of Gregory's collection demanded comment and interpretation. Everyone agreed that, in promulgating important legislation, the Pope normally took counsel with his cardinals, and everyone agreed that it was right and proper for him to do so. What was by no means clear was whether the Pope could, if he so chose, dispense with such counsel—whether the cardinals, for all their dignity and prestige, were in essence mere agents of the Pope, or whether, by virtue of their office, they participated as of right in the authority of the Apostolic See.[66]

---

[64] Bernardus Parmensis, defending the cardinals' claim to countersign papal privileges (gloss *ad* II, 20, 28), can quote only two passages from Gratian, neither of which has any real reference to the authority of cardinals (C. 12, q. 2, c. 68, and C. 35, q. 9, c. 3). However, according to the archdeacon, the view that the Pope could not establish a general law for the whole Church without consent of the cardinals was maintained in the *Glossa Palatina,* a compilation made between 1210 and 1215 and discovered by Kuttner (*Repertorium,* pp. 81-82). The archdeacon attributed this view to to Laurentius, but on the whole question cf. S. Kuttner, "Bernardus Compostellanus Antiguus," *Traditio* I (1943), 288-91, 309.

[65] A. P. Potthast, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* (Berlin, 1875), n. 1546.

[66] Both views appeared as early as the eleventh century. By then the word 'cardinal' was usually taken to be derived from 'cardo,' a hinge (cf. S. Kuttner, "Cardinalis, etc.," pp. 132-152). This made possible two quite different metaphorical interpretations of the status of the cardinals. Cardinal Deusdedit could assert that they were themselves the 'hinges' that guided and moved the whole Church (cf. W. v. Glanvell, *Die Kanonessammlung des Kardinales Deusdedit* (Paderborn, 1905), p. 268). But it could also be held that the cardinals' name was derived merely from their close dependence on the Pope, himself the 'hinge' of the Church Universal, and this it seems was what Pope Leo IX understood by the term (Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* XIX, 653B). St. Peter Damian called the cardinals "spirituales ecclesiae universales senatores" *(Contra Philargyriam* in Migne,

The most distinguished of the predecessors of Hostiensis among the commentators and glossators of the *Gregoriana* seem to have been somewhat embarrassed by the necessity for reconciling the undoubted constitutional importance of the cardinals with the current theory of papal absolutism and so fell into self-contradiction or unconvincing evasions. Goffredus Tranensis states that the authority competent to found general constitutions is "papa cum fratribus suis,"[67] but elsewhere, applying to the legislative authority of the Pope an old Roman adage, says, "omnia autem iura sunt in pectore papae."[68] Bernardus Parmensis asserts that the cardinals are "pars corporis domini papae,"[69] but seems to use the phrase loosely, applying it to other members of the curia as well.[70] Innocent IV declares on one occasion that the business of the cardinals is the care of all the churches,[71] but elsewhere time and again reiterates that the Pope personally has *plenitudo potestatis.*[72]

Hostiensis takes up the suggestion that the cardinals are "part of the Pope's body," and, unlike Bernardus, shows himself willing to accept all its implications. Indeed, his contention that the Roman see, like any other bishopric, is subject to the normal rules of the law of corporations, forms the basis of his analysis of papal authority, and,

---

Patrologia Latina, CVL, 540). The description of the cardinals as 'senators' recurs in the thirteenth century in the work of Innocent IV, *Commentaria,* II, 27, 23, fol. 314, col. 4.

[67] Goffredus Tranensis, *Summa in titulos Decretalium* (Venetiis, 1586), *De constitutionibus,* fol. 2, n. 8.

[68] *Ibid.*, fol. 3, n. 15.

[69] Gloss *ad* I, 30, 9. *s.v.* 'commissum.'

[70] Gloss *ad* II, 40, 14, *s.v.* 'fructus.'

[71] *Commentaria,* I, 5, 3, fol. 37, col. 3.

[72] The controversy concerning the status of the cardinals continued into the fourteenth century. Nicholas III defined the position of the cardinals as *coadjutores,* whose advice it was fitting for the Pope to seek; but this definition was not sufficiently precise to prevent future disagreements. Compare, e.g., the gloss of Joannes Monachus on *Sextus,* V, 3, 1, with that of the archdeacon on *Sextus,* I, 6, 3. Joannes Monachus suggests that the Pope has his administrative authority from the cardinals. The Archdeacon treats with derision the idea that the cardinals have the power of modifying a papal decree, on the grounds that they have their power only from man (i.e., from the Pope), while the Pope's power is from God alone. The status of the cardinals during a papal vacancy was clarified by the decrees *Ubi periculum* of Gregory X, in the second Council of Lyons (*Sextus,* I, 6, 3), and *Ne Romani* of Clement V (*Clem.* I, 3, 2).

especially in his *Lectura,* he returns to the point again and again. It is established first that the cardinals do in fact have the rights of a corporation, in reply to those canonists who asserted that they were to be considered only as individuals, "called from diverse parts of the world and installed in diverse churches." [73] On the contrary, says Hostiensis, they form a single body, meeting together to transact the business of the whole Church, "summum et excellens collegium super omnia alia unitum a Deo cum papa, quod cum ipso unum et idem est."[74]

This unity between Pope and cardinals is stressed again when it is maintained that the cardinals need not, like other clergy, offer an oath of obedience to the Pope since they are actually part of himself, "tanquam sibi invisceratis," and there must be a difference between the one offering and the one receiving an oath of allegiance.[75] The constitutional position arising from this unity is explained in a most significant passage:

> . . . multo magis et multo excellentius est unio inter papam et collegium Romanae ecclesiae quam etiam inter aliquam patriarcham et capitulum suum . . . et tamen patriarcha sine consilio fratrum non debet ardua expedire. . . . Multo fortius ergo decet papam consilia fratrum suorum requirere . . . *non solum papa sed et cardinales includerenter in expressione plenitudinis potestatis.*[76]

The clause "includerenter in expressione plenitudinis potestatis" defines exactly Hostiensis' view of the status of the cardinals. They form with the Pope a collegiate body that has the exercise of the *plenitudo potestatis* divinely bestowed on the Roman Church. It follows, therefore, as a necessary corollary of the theory of Hostiensis regarding the structure of corporations, that when a Pope dies the jurisdiction of this body devolves to the cardinals. This he quite consistently maintains, holding that during a papal vacancy *plenitudo potestatis* rests with the Roman Church, and the exercise of it with the College of Cardinals.[77]

---

[73] *Lectura, De Judeis,* V, 6, 17, fol. 32, col. 4, "Nota contra illos qui dicunt quod cardinales non habent jus capituli, sed potius jure singulorum censentur tanquam homines a diversis mundi partibus vocati et in diversis ecclesiis intitulati . . . sed errant evidenter."

[74] *Lectura, loc. cit.*

[75] *Lectura, De privilegiis,* V, 33, 23, fol. 85, col. 3.

[76] *Lectura, Qui fiilii sint legitimi,* IV, 17, 3, fol. 39, col. 1.

He first proves the point by the assertion that such is the normal rule governing the affairs of corporations that lack a rector, and then goes on to adduce numerous arguments urging that the normal rule should be applied in this particular case. He argues that the cardinals exercise authority by tradition and good customs should be preserved, that Christ would not wish His Church to lack a pastor, that it is absurd and not far from heresy to hold that the Roman Church, the head of all the churches, could itself lack a head. He claims moreover that the cardinal-bishops are endowed with papal authority by virtue of the fact that they take the place of metropolitans during a vacancy in the Roman See. Clearly Hostiensis was determined to press into service every argument possible to prove his point, and the reason becomes evident at the end of the passage, "Haec scribo ad confutandos illos qui potestatem cardinalium quasi adnihilare videntur."[78] Hostiensis, a cardinal himself, was not unnaturally a zealous defender of the dignity and prestige of the Sacred College.

Even more important than this account of the status of the cardinals during a papal vacancy is the analysis of their authority in association with a reigning Pope, of the relationship between the component parts of the corporate body that exercises the power of the Roman Church. Hostiensis frequently states that the Pope should not proceed in important matters without the advice of the cardinals,[79] and even seems to imply that his proper function is merely to carry out their wishes: "Sicut papa cardinalium consilio regitur sic episcopi canonicorum regi debent." [80] But to interpret this as meaning that for Hostiensis the Pope is always and necessarily 'ruled' by his cardinals, would not only oversimplify, but would seriously distort his views. He insists on the close union between Pope and cardinals but does not forget that within this corporate unity the Pope is the 'head' to whom the cardinals are 'immediately subject.' [81] Indeed, he expressly declares that a binding law can be issued by the Pope alone.[82] This is in accordance with the principle that, when a corporation is provided with a rector, the exercise of its jurisdiction rests with him, "sede autem instituta habet exercitium prelatus sed de consilio capituli."[83]

---

[77] *Lectura, De penitentiis et remissionibus,* V, 38, 14, fol. 102, col. 3: ". . . pone papam mortuum, quero penes quem resideret haec potestas. Respondeo utique penes Romanam ecclesiam quae mori non potest . . . sed numquid collegium cardinalium habet jurisdictionem papae et etiam exercitium ipsius . . . tu teneas quod sic." In spite of this, Hostiensis holds, rather inconsistently, that the cardinals have not the power to reject or even to modify the decree of Alexander III governing the conduct of papal elections. This was to answer those who asserted that the concession of too great authority to the cardinals might lead to schisms and the prolongation of papal vacancies.

[78] *Lectura, loc. cit.:* ". . . tunc et quia cardinales sic utuntur . . . nam et beata consuetudo est attendenda in talibus . . . tunc quia visibile est quod filio Dei placeat hic intellectus ne ecclesiam videtur reliquisse sine pastore . . . et valde est absurdum sentire quod illa ecclesia capite careat quae caput est aliarum . . . immo etiam nec est longe ab heresi . . . episcopi cardinales proculdubio vices metropolitani obtinent . . . et exponi opportet metropolitani .i. papae, qui nec alius posset esse metropolitanus Romanae ecclesiae."

[79] *Summa, De officio legati,* col. 278, n. 2. *Lectura, De officio legati,* I, 30, 9,

A definition of the precise relations between Pope and cardinals must clearly turn on the interpretation of the words *de consilio,* and Hostiensis' views on the significance of this term have already been discussed. His general conclusion was that the words in themselves do not imply a necessity for consent, but that a prelate does require consent of his chapter in grave matters where the well-being of his church might be injured. The Pope and cardinals, however, form a collegiate body charged with the government of the Church as a whole, and therefore Hostiensis maintains, consistently enough, that the Pope can normally act on his own initiative—but always provided that his actions do not tend to "subvert the well-being of the Universal Church." [84]

One of the most important of the matters in which the well-being of the whole Church might be affected is the decision of cases involving disputed articles of faith, and it is in this connection, according to Hostiensis, that the residuary authority of the whole *universitas fidelium* may come into play through a general council, when the Roman Church fails to exercise adequately its function of headship.

The reintroduction of the general council into canonistic theory as an important element in the government of the Church is an even more interesting feature of Hostiensis' theory than his systematization

---

fol. 146, col. 1, *De Judeis,* V, 6, 17, fol. 32, col. 4, *De privilegiis,* V, 33, 23, fol. 85, col. 3.

[80] *Summa, De officio archipresbyteri,* col. 238, n. 2.

[81] *Summa, De penitentiis et remissionibus,* col. 1574, n. 15.

[82] *Summa, Proemium,* col. 8, n. 14.

[83] *Summa, De officio ordinarii,* col. 299, n. 3.

[84] *Summa, De constitutionibus,* col. 19, n. 3.

of the current views on the authority of the Sacred College. Towards the middle of the thirteenth century, the view that any council exercised an authority opposed to and limiting that of the Pope seems almost to have fallen out of currency; Bernardus Parmensis, Goffredus Tranensis, and Innocent IV hardly mention councils except to emphasize their subservience to the Pope.[85] This attitude might have been reasonable had they suggested some alternative method of restraining a Pope who was acting against the well-being of the Church, and it would at least have been consistent had they maintained that the Pope was beyond all human control. But in fact they all slavishly repeated the formula that a Pope could be accused for heresy, without even the slightest attempt to define the procedure to be adopted.[86]

Throughout the work of Hostiensis there is a renewed emphasis on the authority of councils. Where Innocent IV would usually quote a decree passed in a general council as the decree of such-and-such a Pope, Hostiensis nearly always cites it as the decree of a general council, as though this gave it additional weight. In discussions he points to the fact that his own view has been upheld by a general council as incontrovertible proof of its validity,[87] and finally he explicitly lays down that a general council is the ultimate authority in matters of faith, since it expresses the mind of the Universal Church, which cannot err: "Quis ergo magistrum contra concilium generale dicere attentabit, nam talia sunt servanda sicut quattuor evangelia, nec enim ecclesia universalis errare potest." [88]

The mention of the 'quattuor evangelia' in the passage quoted is a reference to Gratian's *Dist.* 15, c. 2, where a decree of Gregory I lays down that the first four general councils of the Church are to be respected like the four Gospels themselves. Hostiensis goes on to make the important point that the special authority attributed there to the 'four councils' belongs of necessity to all general councils since all alike represent the whole Church.[89]

---

[85] Bernardus, gloss *ad Decretales,* I, 6, 4. Casus: Goffredus, *Summa, De constitutionibus,* fol. 3, n. 10; Innocent, *op. cit.,* I, 9, 12, fol. 95.

[86] Bernardus, gloss *ad* I, 6, 6, *s.v. 'exceptione'*; Goffredus, *op. cit., De accusationibus,* fol. 189, n. 2; Innocent, *op. cit.,* V, 40, 23, fol. 567. In each case there is a reference to *Dist.* 40, c. 6.

[87] *Summa, De usucapionibus,* col. 1627, n. 5.

[88] *Summa, De decimis et primitiis,* col. 974, n. 15.

[89] *Summa, loc. cit.*: "Licet enim illa jura non loquantur de concilio generali praedicto, loquuntur tamen de consimili, et necesse est ut cum ecclesia generalis

Since a general council is the ultimate authority in questions of faith, it would seem that it must have in the last resort the right to decide cases where the issue is one of heresy. The procedure for handling such cases, from the lowest court to the highest, is discussed in the *Lectura*.[90] First Hostiensis suggests that in cases of this sort not only counsel but consent is necessary: "forsan hic ponitur concilium pro consensu." If, therefore, a bishop does not agree with the *maior et sanior pars* of his chapter, the case must be referred to his immediate superior, the metropolitan. If there is still no agreement between the *maior et sanior pars* and the metropolitan, it must go "ad Romanam ecclesiam." But there remains the possibility that the Pope might disagree with his cardinals and, since the issue is one where consent is required, he would be unable to proceed without them. Hostiensis does not discuss in this context the situation that would then arise, but the implication of his argument seems clear. At every stage of the process disagreement means that the case must be referred to a higher authority, and in this matter of a disputed article of faith there is an authority superior to Pope and cardinals, a general council of the whole Church (since only a general council is considered infallible in such matters).

It seems, therefore, that, when Pope and cardinals disagree on a matter of faith, the Pope has a clear duty to summon a council. Hostiensis also suggests that where there is suspicion concerning the orthodoxy of the Pope, the proper authority to deal with the case is a general council,[91] and this again seems to imply a duty on the part of the Pope to summon such a council. There still remains the problem of dealing with an obdurate Pope who might refuse to do so, for canon law laid down explicitly that a general council could be summoned only by the authority of the Apostolic See. Here again the application of Hostiensis' theory of corporations provides an adequate

---

illorum et istius auctrix sit, quod de uno dicitur, de altero intelligitur." The appeal to the authority of these four councils as a justification of the claims put forward for contemporary general councils re-appears in the fourteenth century. Cf. Marsilius, *Defensor pacis,* II, 20, 319, and among later writers, Conrad of Gelnhausen, *Epistola concordiae,* in Martène and Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum* (Paris, 1717), II, cols. 1200-26, especially col. 1205.

[90] *Lectura, De hereticis,* V, 7, 9, fol. 35, col. 1.

[91] *Summa, De accusationibus,* col. 1293, n. 7. "Excipitur unum solum crimen super quo papa accusari potest . . . (i.e. haeresim) . . . convocato forte super hoc concilio generali."

solution of the difficulty. The Pope normally summons a general council, but this is because he normally exercises the power of the Roman Church and, in the view of Hostiensis, there are special circumstances in which the exercise of this power devolves to others.

Such a case arises, for instance, if the whole College of Cardinals should become extinct at a time when the Roman See is vacant. Hostiensis suggests that then the Roman clergy and people have the right of electing a new Pope, or of summoning a general council to do so: "Clerus et populus Romanus debent concilium convocare, arg. opt. 65 Dist. si forte."[92] This is in accordance with his usual principle of a *universitas* exercising during a vacancy the authority normally exercised by its *caput*. If the Romans without cardinals can summon a council, still more would it seem can the cardinals do so, and this is implied in the *Summa* when it is said that the cardinals cannot alter Alexander's election decree even if they obtain consent of a council.[93]

It might appear that such cases are relevant only when the Roman See is vacant, and provide no guidance for dealing with an obdurate Pope. But, when cardinals and Pope disagree in a matter in which neither can proceed without the consent of the other, the Church certainly lacks an *effective* head, and Hostiensis seems to regard this as sufficient grounds for an exercise of the authority of the Roman See without the agency of the Pope. Moreover, *Dist.* 65 c. 9, cited as 'arg. opt.,' for proving that the Roman clergy may summon a council, refers to a case in which a council should be summoned by the clergy of a diocese, not because there is no bishop to do so, but because the bishop is negligent. The implication of this line of argument is that, when the head of a corporation refuses to fulfill his clear duties, the position is the same as if the corporation lacked a head, and the residual authority of the whole body comes into play.[94] This is entirely in accordance with the view of Hostiensis described earlier, that the authority conceded to a corporation's head can never confer on him a right to act in a manner prejudicial to the well-being of the whole corporation.

The system of ecclesiastical government that Hostiensis constructs might be described as a hierarchy of corporations. Ultimate authority rests with the *congregatio fidelium,* the whole body of the faithful, but the normal exercise of this authority is committed by God to the Roman Church. The Roman Church is itself a corporation, whose headship resides in a collegiate body comprising Pope and cardinals, and within this body again, primacy belongs to the Pope. The Pope as successor to the see of Peter has no individual superior on earth, but the very nature of the episcopal authority that he exercises creates binding obligations between him and the other prelates of his church, so that the cardinals are associated with him; indeed, are regarded as part of himself in the exercise of the authority of the Apostolic See. There is provision for the devolution of authority from head to members so as to provide for the continuance of effective government in the Church in nearly all foreseeable circumstances. Thus, when the Pope is dead, the exercise of his authority passes to the cardinals; if the whole college should be extinct, or in disagreement with the Pope in a matter of faith, to the clergy and people of the Roman Church. These, in turn, can summon a general council representing the *universitas* of the whole Church to deal with the situation. The working out of the details of the theory is ingenious and sometimes complex, but there is an underlying simplicity in the consistent application of the same clearly defined principles to the solution of a variety of problems.

---

[92] *Lectura, De electione,* I, 6, 6, fol. 33, n. 3.

[93] *Summa, De electione,* 106, n. 18.

[94] Gerson argued in much the same way that when a Pope refused to fulfil a clear duty to summon a council, the council could assemble without his authority. Cf. E. F. Jacob, *Essays in the Conciliar Epoch,* p. 12.

A most impressive aspect of the achievement of Hostiensis is that, at a time when the system of papal absolutism was at its zenith, he was able to foresee and to analyze all the potential weaknesses in the constitutional structure of the Church that were to be brought to light by the historical developments of the next century. For instance, his attempt to define the constitutional status of the College of Cardinals anticipated the views put forward during the conflict between Boniface VIII and the Colonna cardinals; and Cardinal Joannes Monachus, a leading canonist of the early fourteenth century, who restated the claims of the cardinals after the Colonna troubles, merely followed point by point the opinions of Hostiensis, though usually without acknowledgement. He emphasized that the relationship between the Pope and cardinals is the same as that between any bishop and his chapter, that, therefore, the Pope cannot proceed, at any rate in important matters, without consulting the cardinals, and that the cardinals exercise the full powers of the Pope during a papal vacancy.[95]

---

[95] Joannes Monachus in his glosses *ad Sextus,* I, 6, 16, fol. 92; V ,2, 4, fol. 347; V, 3, 1; fol. 366. He quotes the opinion of Hostiensis regarding the powers of a Pope during a papal vacancy at V, 11, 2, fol. 399, and it seems in-

Hostiensis not only foresaw the problems that were to arise for the Church in the next century from the type of constitutional development that was taking place in his own day, but also helped to formulate some of the concepts that were to be used by later thinkers who propounded solutions more radical than his own. The relationship between his theory of the structure of corporations and Marsilius' theory of the State has already been discussed. It might also be suggested that the doctrine put forward by Occam and John of Paris maintaining that the whole Church could continue in existence without a head, or in severance from the Roman Church, is a particular application of the general theory of corporations that Hostiensis had consistently applied.[96]

Such writers were using concepts, which Hostiensis had helped to mould, to construct theories that, in many respects, he would have rejected wholeheartedly. But later, at the time of the conciliar movement, one finds the frequent expression of opinions more completely in accordance with his own. Indeed, in the works of some of the most influential of the conciliarists, one can discern not only resemblances to the thought of Hostiensis but frequent traces of his direct influence. Conrad of Gelnhausen, whose treatise *Epistolae Concordiae* marks "a turning point in the history of the Schism,"[97] turned to him for a proof that in some circumstances a general council might be summoned without the authority of the Pope; and some of the leading ideas of Cardinal Zabarella's influential tract followed closely the arguments of Hostiensis. Zabarella maintained, e.g., that the cardinals participate in the Pope's *plenitudo potestatis* as "parts of his body," and that if disagreement arises between them and the Pope, it can be resolved only by summoning a general council representing the whole Church.[98] In putting forward these views Zabarella relied on

---

conceivable that he should not have been fully informed of all the claims of his great predecessor on behalf of the cardinals. The views of Joannes Monachus are discussed in W. Ullmann, *Origins of the Great Schism*, pp. 204-207. Cf. also F. Lajard in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, XXVII, 201-224.

[96] C. C. Bayley remarks that, "in the manipulation of the texts and concepts that were the *loci communes* of canon and Roman law . . . Ockham displays an almost terrifying efficiency." "Pivotal Concepts in the Political Philosophy of William of Ockham," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, X (1949), 199.

[97] Ullman, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

[98] To prove that a council may be summoned without the authority of the Pope, Zabarella cites *Dist.* 65, c. 9, Hostiensis' "arg. opt." Cf. his *De schismate* in S. Schard, *De jurisdictione, auctoritate et praeeminentia imperiali* (Basle, 1586), p. 691.

the arguments of fourteenth-century canonists who derived their ideas from Hostiensis through Joannes Monachus.[99] Zabarella's definition of the status of the Pope as head of a corporation is, again, precisely in accordance with the theory of Hostiensis:

> . . . id quod dicitur, quod papa habet plenitudinem potestatis, debet intelligi non solus sed tanquam apud universitatem, ita quod ipsa potestas est in ipsa universitate tanquam in fundamento, et papa tanquam in principali ministro, per quem haec potestas explicitur.[100]

Moreover, the leading writers of the conciliar age, like the publicists of the early fourteenth century, had frequent recourse to the doctrines of the law of corporations in discussing such questions as the mode of assembly of councils, the rights of majorities, and the method of reckoning a majority.[101]

It is, perhaps, in his demonstration that the rules of corporation law could be applied effectively to the widest of human communities, to a *universitas* embracing the whole of Christendom, even more than in the detailed working out of his own theory, that one may discern the chief significance of the work of Hostiensis for the future. If, indeed, one were to accept Gierke's view that the application of the Romano-canonical doctrine of corporations to the broad fields of Church government and political theory represented a regrettable departure from "properly mediaeval" modes of thought, it would be necessary to cast Hostiensis for the rôle of chief villain of the piece. It seems more appropriate, though, to respect him as an unusually gifted canonist whose insight into the constitutional problems of the Church was unrivalled in his own century and, perhaps, hardly surpassed in the next.

Pembroke College
Cambridge

---

[99] Cf. Ullmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 191 ff., for an analysis of the canonistic background of Cardinal Zabarella.

[100] Zabarella, *op. cit.*, p. 703.

[101] Cf. Gierke, *Political Theories*, ed. cit., p. 64.

Most of the materials for this article were gathered in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. The writer is glad to take this opportunity of thanking the librarian, Mr. H. M. Adams, and his staff for their unfailing courtesy and helpfulness.

MISCELLANY

LAND FOR A CATHEDRAL: BALTIMORE, 1806-1817

By

William D. Hoyt, Jr.*

Announcement of plans for the construction of a new cathedral on the northern outskirts of Baltimore has raised the question of what will be the status of the old Cathedral of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This venerable structure, designed by Benjamin Henry Latrobe, built during 1806-1821, long a landmark of downtown Baltimore, and since 1936 a minor basilica, is the premier cathedral of the Catholic Church in the United States. In this connection, the original agreement for the purchase of the land on which the cathedral was erected has recently come to light among the Howard Papers at the Maryland Historical Society.

Colonel John Eager Howard (1752-1827), Revolutionary hero, former Governor of Maryland, and former member of the United States Senate, was outstanding among Baltimore's prominent citizens because he owned much of the property in the path of the city's northward expansion. It was on April 19, 1806, that Colonel Howard affixed his signature to the deed of sale, with Bishop John Carroll signing as president of "The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore." The tract involved was a full block bounded by Charles, Mulberry, and Franklin Streets, the fourth line to run along a new street which Howard promised to open and to name Cathedral Street. The price was to be $20,571.60, a fifth to be paid by January 1, 1807, and the rest to be divided into four annual installments with interest.

The subsequent business transactions appear to have been carried on by Luke Tiernan (1757-1839), Irish-born merchant, a trustee of the enterprise, and—in spite of having eleven children—himself a large contributor to the cathedral building fund. At the bottom of the deed are signed receipts for various amounts paid to Howard during each of the eight years, 1807-1814, except 1810. The absence of any payment in that year is explained by a separate paper, dated February 28, 1810, which states that, "In consequence of the Injury to the property by the grade of Charles Street as now fixed and established," Howard agreed to reduce the total price to $20,000 and to relinquish all interest due at that time.[1]

It seems, however, that even this reduction of the cost of the land was not sufficient to pave the way for full payment of the debt. On May 10, 1815, Colonel Howard noted on the back of the 1810 document that the trustees were desirous of disposing of part of the tract and that he agreed to execute deeds to the respective purchasers. The portion of the block to be sold was the northern third, which was to be separated from the cathedral grounds by an eighteen-foot alley. The first of these sales was made on October 15, 1815, to John F. Gibney, and comprised the lot on the southwest corner of Charles and Franklin Streets (later the site of the Samuel Hoffman house occupied in the 1890's by Sir William Osler, now the location of the Rochambeau Apartments). During subsequent months the two lots to the westward along Franklin Street were sold to Cornelius Comegys, a dry goods merchant, and to George Crosdale (1776-1820) and John Gibson (1775-1861), partners in a mercantile establishment. The entire center of the section was purchased by the Reverend Enoch Fenwick (d. 1827), pastor of St. Peter's Church, and the other end lot (southeast corner of Franklin and Cathedral Streets) became the possession of Hugh Boyle, iron merchant. Apparently buildings were not erected immediately on the land thus cut from the original acquisition, for Fielding Lucas' map of 1822 shows nothing in the block except the newly-completed cathedral.[2]

---

* Mr. Hoyt is associate professor of history at Loyola College, Baltimore.

[1] Tiernan on February 28, 1810, signed a statement that "a meeting of the Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church of St. Peters held at the Revd. Bishop Carrolls on the 5th January" preceding had accepted Howard's proposals.

> ARTICLES OF AGREEMENT indented, made, and concluded this nineteenth day of April in the year of our Lord One thousand, eight hundred, and six between John Eager Howard of Baltimore County in the State of Maryland Gentleman of the one part, and "The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore" of the other part:
>
> First. The said John Eager Howard for, and in consideration of the sum of Twenty thousand, five hundred, and seventy one Dollars, and Sixty cents money of the United States to be paid in the manner hereinafter mentioned doth hereby for himself, his heirs, Executors, and Administrators, and every of them covenant, promise, and agree to, and with "The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore" aforesaid, their successors and assigns in manner following, that is to say: That on receiving payment of the aforesaid sum of money in the manner, and at the times herein after specified, and limited for the payment of the same, he the said John Eager Howard, his heirs, and assigns, and all, and every other person, and persons whatsoever claiming, or to claim any right, title, or interest under him, them, or any of the of, in, or to the land, and appurtenances herein after mentioned, shall, and will at the request, proper costs, and charges of "the Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore" aforesaid, their successors, and Assigns by such Deed, or Deeds, conveyances, and assurances, as "the Trustees of the Roman Catholic

---

[2] For a recent discussion of the cathedral of Baltimore, illustrated with plans and pictures, and embodying some correspondence between Archbishop Carroll and Benjamin Henry Latrobe cf. Walter Knight Sturges, "A Bishop and His Architect," *Liturgical Arts*, XVII (February, 1949), 53-64.

Church in the Town of Baltimore" aforesaid, their successors, and assigns, or their Counsel learned in the law shall reasonably devise, advise, or require, well, and sufficiently grant, sell, release, convey, and assure to "The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore" aforesaid, their successors, and Assigns for the purpose of erecting thereon a Catholic Cathedral Church and other buildings ALL THAT piece or parcel of ground situate, lying, and being in Baltimore County near the City of Baltimore, being part of a Tract of Land called "Lunns lot," which is contained within the following metes, and bounds, courses, and distances, to wit: Beginning for the same at a stone set up at the South West corner, or intersection of Charles, and Franklin Streets, and running thence South binding on Charles Street three hundred feet to a stone set up at the North West corner, or intersection of Charles, and Mulberry Streets thence West binding on Mulberry Street three hundred, and twenty feet to a stone set up at the North East corner, or intersection of Mulberry Street, and a new Street to be opened, named, and called Cathedral Street (which said Street the said John Eager Howard hath contracted, and agreed for ever to leave open of the full width of Sixty six feet extending from Franklin Street to Mulberry Street) thence North binding on the said Cathedral Street three hundred feet to a stone set up at the South East corner, or intersection of Cathedral Street and Franklin Street, and thence binding on Franklin Street to the place of beginning; together with the buildings, privileges, and appurtenances to the said piece, or parcel of ground belonging, or in any wise appertaining; which said Deed shall contain a covenant, that the land, and premises aforesaid at the time of such conveyance are free from all incumbrances whatsoever, and all other usual, and reasonable covenants:

IN CONSIDERATION WHEREOF on their part "The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore" aforesaid for themselves, their successors, and Assigns do hereby covenant, promise, and agree to, and with the said John Eager Howard, his heirs, Executors, and Administrators, that they "The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore" aforesaid, their Successors, or Assigns, or some of them shall, and will well, and truly pay, or cause to be paid to the said John Eager Howard, his heirs, Executors, or Administrators the aforesaid sum of Twenty thousand five hundred and seventy one Dollars, and sixty cents money aforesaid in the manner following, that is to say: the sum of four thousand one hundred, and fourteen Dollars, and thirty two cents part thereof to be paid on, or before the first day of January next ensuing the date hereof without interest; the further sum of four thousand one hundred, and fourteen Dollars, and thirty two cents to be paid at, or before the expiration of four years to be computed from the first day of April now last past with legal interest thereon from the first day of April Eighteen hundred, and seven, which interest is to be paid annually; the further sum of four thousand one hundred, and fourteen Dollars, and thirty two cents to be paid at, or before the expiration of five years to be computed from the first day of April now last past with legal interest thereon from the first day of April Eighteen hundred, and seven, which interest is to be paid annually; the further sum of four thousand one hundred, and fourteen Dollars, and thirty two cents to be paid at, or before the expiration of six years to be computed from the first day of April now last past with legal interest thereon from the first day of April Eighteen hundred, and seven, which interest is to be paid annually; and the further sum of four thousand, one hundred, and fourteen Dollars, and thirty two cents to be paid at, or before the expiration of Seven years to be computed from the first day of April now last past, with legal interest thereon from the first day of April Eighteen hundred, and seven, which interest is to be paid annually.

And for the true performance of the covenants, and agreements on the part of the said John Eager Howard, his heirs, and assigns to be kept, and performed, he the said John Eager Howard hereby bindeth himself, his heirs, Executors, Administrators, and assigns to The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore aforesaid, their successors, and assigns in the penal sum of fifty Thousand Dollars.

And for the true performance of the covenants, and agreements on the part of the said Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church, their successors, and assigns to be kept, and performed, they the said Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore hereby bind themselves, their successors, and assigns to the said John Eager Howard, his heirs, Executors, Administrators, and assigns in the penal sum of forty Thousand Dollars.

IN WITNESS whereof the said John Eager Howard hath hereunto set his hand, and affixed his seal, and the Right Reverend John Carroll President of the said Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church in the Town of Baltimore by their direction hath hereunto subscribed his name as President, and hath caused their Corporate Seal to be hereunto affixed on the day and year first above written.

Signed, Sealed, and Delivered
in the presence of

James Power
Leonard Wheeler
J. E. Howard
J. Carroll

1807 March 23d. Received of Luke Tiernan $4114 32/100 in full of the first payment— J. E. Howard

1808 July 11th. Recd. of Bishop Carroll eight hundred dollars on acct. of interest J. E. Howard

1809 April 8th. Recd. of F. Beeston[3] seven hundred and fifty dollars on acct. of interest—also recd. of the same June 2d—two hundred and twenty five dollars and sixty eight cents in full of interest—
J. E. Howard

---

[3] The Reverend Francis Beeston (1751-1809), rector of St. Peter's Church, apparently replaced Tiernan as agent for this payment.

1811 April 10th. Recd. of L. Tiernan nine hundred and sixty dollars in full of interest due the first—inst. J. E. Howard

1812 Jun 3d Recd. of L. Tiernan for one years interest nine hundred & sixty dollars— J. E. Howard

1813 May 10th. Recd. of Luke Tiernan for one years interest nine hundred and sixty dollars. J. E. Howard

1814 Augt. 8th. Recd. of L. Tiernan for one years interest due the 1st. of April last nine hundred and sixty dollars J. E. Howard

The completion of the payments by the trustees may be followed through notations made by Colonel Howard, as follows:

1815				
April	1	Balance due		16000.—
		To int. on do. from 1st April to the 1st Novr.		562.84
1815				$16562.84
Novr.	1	By cash		2762.70
		Balance due 1st Novr 1815		13800.14
		To int. on balance from 1st Novr 1815 to 26th Febr. 1816		266.95
1816				14067.09
Feby	26—	By cash		4500.
		Balance due 26 Febr. 1816		9567.09
		To int. on balance from 26 Feby. 1816 to July 6- 1816		205.45
1816				9772.54
July	6—	By cash		3000
		Balance due, July 6. 1816		$6772.54
		int. on do to 21- Novr 1816		153.21
				$6925.75
		int. from 21 Novr to 1 Jany		45.53
1817				6971.28
Jany	3—	recd D. Williamson	$3819.62	
	9	do L. Tiernan	3130.38	
			in full—6950 —	

With Baltimore raised to archiepiscopal status in 1808, the Church continued to develop in the nineteenth century, and it is possible that later officials wished that all of the original purchase had been retained.

Loyola College
Baltimore

BOOK REVIEWS

GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY

Miscellanea Pio Paschini. Studi di storia ecclesiastica. Two Volumes. [Lateranum, nova series, An. XIV, XV] (Rome: Facultas Theologica Pontificii Athenaei. 1948-1949. Pp. xii, 500; 451.)

Thirty-four scholars have collaborated in the making of this *Festschrift* to mark the seventieth birthday of the distinguished rector of the Lateran Athenaeum. Their contributions range over the whole field of church history and achieve a high standard of excellence. In the first volume G. de Luca provides a sketch of Paschini's life and lists his 312 studies and reviews (pp. 1-26). D. Mallardo, "Le origini della chiesa di Napoli" (pp. 27-68), believes that the first Bishop of Naples, Asprenas, belongs to the first century and suggests that the oldest frescos in the catacombs of San Gennaro date from the first half of the second century. G. Brusin, "Epigrafe aquileiese col Refrigerium" (pp. 69-76), publishes an inscription of 352 A.D. from Aquileia which depicts a deceased Christian in the act of draining a *poculum*. M. Jugie, "Interventions de s. Léon le Grand dans les affaires intérieures des églises orientales" (pp. 77-94), considers some little-known texts which reveal the activity of Pope Leo I in liturgical, disciplinary, and doctrinal matters. E. Peterson, "Die Zauber-Praktiken eines syrischen Bischofs" (pp. 95-102), determines the nature of the magic charged against Bishop Sophronios of Tella at the Robber Synod of 449. O. Bertolini, "Il problema delle origini del potere temporale dei papi nei suoi presupposti teoretici iniziali" (pp. 103-171), maintains that between 743-753 the Holy See came to regard the area of the Roman duchy lost to the Lombards as territory to be regained for St. Peter rather than for the emperor at Constantinople. E. Morhain, "Origine et histoire de la Regula Canonicorum de s. Chrodegang" (pp. 173-185), shows that this rule of 754 A.D. depends largely upon the *Regula S. Benedicti* and the usages of the Roman see. P. Guerrini, "Gli Umiliati a Brescia" (pp. 187-214), assembles details on the fifteen houses of the Umiliati—an order whose members were at once artisans and religious—which were founded at Brescia prior to 1298. F. Callaey, "Documentazione eucaristica liegese . . . 1240-1264" (pp. 215-235), recounts the part played in establishing the feast of Corpus Christi by the Liège circle of St. Julliene of Mont Cornillon. P. Oppenheim, "Eucharistischer Kult und Messopfer" (pp. 237-268), calls attention to the various aspects seen in the Mass by early Christians and traces the development of popular eucharistic devotion. G. Abate, "Il 'Liber epilogorum' di Fra Bartolomeo da Trento" (pp. 269-292), describes two Paduan mss which contain editions of the Dominican's *summa* of liturgical and hagiographical notices dating from 1236-1240

A.D. A. Walz, "Die 'Miracula b. Dominici' der Schwester Cäcilia" (pp. 293-326), provides a critical text of the account of St. Dominic's Roman prodigies which was dictated by the nun Cecilia prior to 1288. L. Oliger, "La caduta di S. Giovanni d'Acri nel 1291 e una leggenda agiografica migratoria" (pp. 327-347), shows that the story of nuns cutting off their noses to avoid violation, customarily told of the Poor Clares at Acre, is earlier related of other communities. By using the Parisian ms B. N. lat. 5376, M. -H. Laurent, "La décime de 1274-1280 dans l'Italie septentrionale" (pp. 349-404), is able to determine in considerable detail for fifty-five dioceses of northern Italy both the officials charged with and the receipts and expenditures involved in the crusade tithe decreed by the Second Council of Lyons. J. Leclercq, "L'idée de la royauté du Christ au XIV^e siècle" (pp. 405-425), notes the diverging practical conclusions drawn by theologians of the regalist and theocratic schools. M. Maccarrone, "Il papa 'Vicarius Christi'" (pp. 427-500), studies the use and meaning of the title during the twelfth to fourteenth centuries.

The second volume opens with A. Mercati, "Documenti dall'Archivio Segreto Vaticano" (pp. 1-37), which includes amongst its twenty-one texts, mostly concerned with Italy, a letter of Queen Elizabeth to the papal Secretary of State dating from 1579. Through employment of a ms now at the Catholic University of America, Stephen Kuttner, "Conciliar Law in the Making" (pp. 39-81), traces in masterly fashion various changes introduced into the legislation of the Second Council of Lyons between its sessions of July and papal promulgation of its decrees in November, 1274. P. S. Leicht, "Il tramonto dello stato patriarcale e la lotta delle parti in Friuli" (pp. 83-108), describes the factional strife which plagued Friuli just before its annexation by Venice in 1420. A. Cassamassa, "L'autore di un preteso discorso di Martino V" (pp. 109-125), shows that the sermon at the translation in 1430 of St. Monica's relics, often ascribed to Pope Martin V, is actually that of Andrea Biglia. A. Campana, "Un nuovo dialogo di Ludovico di Strassoldo" (pp. 127-156), makes available portions of a tract *De regia ac papali potestate* (1434 A.D.) which plagiarizes John of Paris' treatise. M. Bihl, "L'epistola consolatoria di Fra Rangone da Verona" (pp. 165-190), edits an eulogy upon the death in 1465 of the Franciscan preacher Antonio da Bitonto. Noting that Lorenzi continued in papal employ for nine years after his dismissal from the Vatican librarianship in 1492, A. M. Albareda, "Intorno alla fine di Giovanni Lorenzi" (pp. 191-204), contests the view that the humanist met a violent end. Cardinal Mercati, "Un Salterio greco e una catena greca" (pp. 205-211), identifies a text referred to in 1530 by Cardinal Sadoleto. N. Vian, "S. Tommaso More tra la saga e il mito" (pp. 213-222), calls attention to Ellis Heywood's encomium of More published at Florence in 1556. P. de Leturia, "Origine e senso sociale dell'apostolato di s. Ignazio di Loyola in Roma" (pp. 223-249), presents a well organized account of the saint's labors in the Eternal City. C. Dionisotti, "Monumenti Beccadelli" (pp. 251-268), takes notice of archival materials concerning the mid-sixteenth century Archbishop of Ragusa. H. Jedin, "Kardinal Giovanni Ricci, 1497-1574" (pp. 269-358), draws upon the family deposit at Montepulciano in giving the first detailed study of this prelate. J. M. Pou y Marti, "La intervención española en el conflicto entre Paulo V y Venecia" (pp. 359-381), utilizes Spanish embassy archives to throw light upon the conflict of 1605-1607. J. Vives, "Inscripción de una santa Victoria" (pp. 383-393), edits the response of the eighteenth-century savant Pascual upon an inscription found in the Roman crypt of Lucina. G. Vale, "La corrispondenza del PP Benedetto XIV con G. Bini" (pp. 395-408), cites extracts from the exchange of 1753-1758 between the pontiff and a Friuli archpriest. A. Fliche, "L'oeuvre de Dom Brial" (pp. 409-419), pays tribute to the scholar who edited eight volumes of the *Recueil des historiens de la France* prior to his death in 1828. P. Pirri, "Relazione inedita di S. Liebl sulla fuga di Pio IX a Gaeta" (pp. 421-451), makes available an important memorandum by a Bavarian Jesuit who accompanied the Pope during the famed exile of 1848.

HENRY G. J. BECK

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington

Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam. By Harry Austryn Wolfson. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1948. 2nd printing, revised edition. Two volumes. $12.50 per set.)

These two volumes, which reflect their author's exceptional range, and in certain directions his evident depth in the command of source material, go far beyond the philosophy of Philo described in itself and for its own sake. Professor Wolfson states, "The purpose of this book has been to delineate and depict the philosophy of Philo as it shaped itself in his own mind and in its own setting and to indicate briefly how in its main features it was the most dominant force in the history of philosophy down to the seventeenth century." Let it be said at once that the reviewer regards the claim here set forth, by which all philosophy from Philo to Spinoza is designated as "Philonic" in its main features, as fantastic, undemonstrable, and not substantiated by these volumes, despite the concluding chapter (II, 439-460) devoted to underlining that claim.

It is in any case a thoroughly undistinguished position, from his own standpoint, that the author accords to Philo. He is the first to introduce data of revelation into philosophical discussion. If the synthesis for which he thus allegedly established the framework has followers today, two reasons are offered: "inherited tradition," and "the breakdown of philosophy as a learned discipline, from which some inquiring minds try to seek escape in scholasticism as a substitute for scholarship" (II, 459).

From a standpoint which regards data of revelation even as a serious possibility, Philo is engaged in the pursuit of two distinct sciences: theology and philosophy. However those for whom no theology is valid may care to evaluate Professor Wolfson's (or Philo's) amalgam of the results, they can hardly maintain that this hodge-podge forms a legitimate basis for tracing the currents of thought by which either discipline advanced or retrograded during the subsequent centuries. Nor is it always easy, despite a number of keen analyses and much effective presentation of source materials, to follow the author's own thought processes. For example, having headed a long chapter (I, 87-163), "Handmaid of Scripture," he first outlines Philo's attitude toward the diverse currents of Greek philosophical thinking as he knew them; he then discusses allegorical method as a way of interpreting revealed (or any) data, Philo's understanding of the intrinsic truth and certainty of Scriptural knowledge, and his subordination of philosophy to wisdom (i.e., revelation) as the latter's "handmaid," with the consequent subordination of reason to faith. Out of all this grows a reference to "the general adoption in Christian, Moslem and Jewish philosophy of the Philonic view that Scripture has an inner meaning and that that inner meaning is Greek philosophy . . ." (I, 160). Apart from denying on historical grounds that what is thus referred to is factual, the reviewer sees in it a quite unaccountable reversal of the entire trend of the chapter.

Philo's treatment of the possibility of miracles and of the freedom of the human will are both subjected to question-begging references, many times repeated, such as, "freedom like that enjoyed by God, who by His power to work miracles can upset the laws of nature"; in a similar connection Philo is credited (I, 316) with the opinion that "God can always change His will for some good reason." Small wonder that the author is unprepared to see any development in these matters up to the time of Spinoza. The references to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity are pitiful and irresponsible. The Wisdom of Solomon is said to indicate the identity of premundane Wisdom and the Law of Moses; there is no legitimate way of arriving at this conclusion from that book as a whole. On the activity ascribed in the same book to Wisdom at the creation, Professor Wolfson's reasoning (I, 288) is specious, cf. Wis. 13, 1; 13, 11; 14, 2. The very real dependence of the Book of Wisdom on Isaias to provide a prophetic background for affirmations of blessed immortality is instanced (I, 388) on the basis of the one context which in both books means something quite different.

The reviewer is prompted to the reflection that if Spinoza, along with the most unexpected modern writers, is to be found grubbing in the ashes of the distinguished but undeniable failures at a presentable and tenable synthesis, apart from data of revelation, that constitute the pagan philosophies of ancient Greece, it is because, apart from the indirect and extrinsic support of such data, no purely human philosophy is vital enough to establish an enduring place for itself. That is why also the history of philosophy is the only "philosophical" discipline of serious moment in many institutions of higher learning today.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN

The Catholic University of America

Christianity and History. By Herbert Butterfield. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1950. Pp. vi, 146. $2.75.)

Here is a book to feed the mind of a philosopher. A Yorkshire Methodist, master of monographic research and occupant of Acton's chair of modern history at Cambridge, reflects upon the nature and limits of the historical discipline and demonstrates how rich is the nourishment that Christian wisdom provides for the practitioner of that science.

Bad historical writing originates in the misunderstanding of human nature and the misconception of the purpose of historical study. That purpose is not to unveil or illustrate some fancied schematic structure of development, or progress, or evolution, but to obtain a more profound knowledge of ourselves. The proper task of the historian is to probe into and verify by every possible means the experience of mankind, so that by seeing themselves in one dimension more men may gain a better understanding of what kind of creatures God fashioned them to be. History is not a "march of time" panorama of progress from the amoeba to the world state; the generations of men are not enslaved in the service of some emergent ultimate pattern for the life of the race. "When we first look at our ancestors without this lesson in our minds . . . we arrive at inconsistencies and distortions. . . . The technique of historical study itself demands that we shall look upon each generation as, so to speak, an end in itself, a world of people existing in their own right." In truth, the more closely we examine the lives and characters of even the most remote times the more we are struck by the determinate uniformity of human nature. Although each human soul is unique and each generation differs from all others in concrete background and experience, yet all are alike substan-
tyranny of presumptuous textbook abridgements and theoretical general-
not historical.

Professor Butterfield, therefore, bids us emancipate our minds from the
tially, and the ends for which all human beings exist are transcendental,

izations which falsify reality by substituting historical ideology for true history, and recommends that we make a more intense effort to know what the past really was. Neglect of this effort has been no small cause of the catastrophe that fell upon the world in this century, because presumptuous ignorance in politics springs from the "intellectual arrogance, or mental rigidity, or stiff-necked self-assurance" which is able to insinuate itself into what passes in the schools for history "more powerfully and with more dangerous guile than in all other forms of scholarship and science put together." It is, perhaps, a commonplace to point out that false philosophy produces false history, but Butterfield is not laboring the obvious when he reminds us of the mighty influence that false historical notions can exercise to render minds susceptible to false philosophy. When historical education gets into the hands of "heavy pedagogues, who teach a hard story in a rigid framework"—e.g., the progress of democracy as the key to modern history—it becomes a discipline for darkening the intellect, generating moral and political superstitions, and incapacitating men for self-knowledge or any correct appreciation of the more profound characteristics of their own age.

If we are to profit from historical study—i.e., grow in wisdom—we must not expect to draw from it a philosophy or religion. Historical life does not provide the ultimate valuations and interpretations: "When we have reconstructed the whole of mundane history it does not form a self-explanatory system, and our attitude to it, our whole relationship to the human drama is a larger affair altogether—it is a matter not of scholarship but of religion." But the interesting fact is that the more profoundly and realistically we probe into any historical moment or event; the more we analyze the circumstances, apprehend the purposes, and seek to plumb that deepest well of mystery—human motivation; the more confirmation do we find for the Christian philosophy of human nature. We discover the infirmities resulting from the fall; we see the judgment that history ultimately passes upon men's folly in denying or defying Providence; we locate the vital springs of action in personalities rather than in the species or in abstract ideal forces. By fixing our eyes on men, we discover the free but errant will and the partly darkened intellect; and we ultimately find that the historical event is but an external expression of a spiritual activity, a *motio metaphysica.* Then do we sense what Butterfield calls the subtlety and delicacy of the texture of history,—"as light as gossamer, light as the thought of the person merely thinking it, and its patterns seem to change as easily as the patterns of wind on water." In other words, we find that historical life bears a just correspondence to the life of our own souls as we make our dangerous terrestrial pilgrimage knowing, if we are wise, that heaven or hell may turn upon an idle word and that without God's grace we should plunge forthwith into the abyss.

So does historical study, realistically pursued, provide the mind with wisdom. And similarly, the Christian philosophy of human nature, which every one may have from heaven and confirm in his own small experience without the aid of academic history, supplies the historian with indispensable equipment for probing that past which is nothing other than the experience of his fellow men who preceded him in the temporal order. It keeps the historian's eye focussed on its proper object; it gives a key to character and a sense of relevancy, so that he may ask the right questions and select the most fruitful lines of inquiry; it alerts the mind to a realization that history is "a peculiar science in that it depends so much on things which can only be discovered and verified by insight, sympathy and imagination." Historical research pursued in this spirit and with these means results in works of wisdom.

Professor Butterfield has shown that he knows how to practice what he preaches, for his recent monograph on *George III, Lord North and the People* is a near-perfect example of erudition focussed upon a vital decisive moment and exploring circumstances and human behavior to the limit of the sources and in the light of a true knowledge of human nature. Reading literature of this kind, one has a sense of fullness and reality and of enlarging the scope of life's experience. The soul is fed.

There is, I believe, only one dissenting note that a Catholic thinker will wish to strike against Mr. Butterfield's philosophy. But it is important and derives from a matter of religion. Mr. Butterfield does not expressly define his own religion, but he probably summed it up in alluding to "a Christianity that is ancient, something which has been available to anybody in our part of the world for fifteen hundred years—a religion of the spirit, otherworldly if you like, preaching charity and humility, trusting Providence and submitting to it, and setting its heart and its treasure in heaven. Such a religion does at least save men from making gods out of sticks and stones, and offering vast human sacrifices to abstract nouns, and running amok with myths of righteousness, especially myths of self-righteousness, as people have so often done in the twentieth century." On this ground, which he believes to be a rock, Butterfield takes his stand. It is a very heroic stand, in part because it is a very lonely stand. From it he looks back on the human past in which "the systems break, the organizations crumble, though man himself goes on," and he looks forward to a future in which the same shall be again. Foreswearing all terrestrial loyalties, he closes his book with the injunction: "Hold fast to Christ, and for the rest be totally uncommitted." But holding to Christ should mean holding not only to fellowship in the Mystical Body but also to the Church Militant which made and still cultivates and guards a garden in the midst of the jungle of this world. There is a wonderful work of art, in stone and wood and bread and wine as well as in loving human relations, built on the soil of this earth in patterns of the greatest beauty. We must protect that garden from the jungle. The men of Christendom must cherish its works as well as its faith, for there is a danger in being too "otherworldly"—the danger of going down that slippery side of the rock which carries one into a Lutheran non-resistance to evil. Professor Butterfield seems little aware of that. It is a defect more likely to distort his political judgments in the present and future than to impair his vision of the past, although that, too, could be sharpened by an even better apprehension of the Christian philosophy of man.

Ross J. S. Hoffman

Fordham University

Justin the First. An Introduction to the Epoch of Justinian the Great. [Dumbarton Oaks Studies, I]. By A. A. Vasiliev. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. viii, 439. $6.00.)

Professor Vasiliev's exhaustive monograph is the first one ever devoted to the emperor whose reign constituted a not unworthy preamble to that of his renowned nephew Justinian. It fills a long-felt lacuna and brilliantly fulfils the expectations of all acquainted with the distinguished productions of this great Byzantinologist. It is because I do not share Vasiliev's optimism regarding the better opportunity of modern historians to approach the religious problems of Justin's day (p. 134)—for no "advantage of historical perspective" can make up for today's lack of theological training—that I regard it a high merit of this book to stress the importance of these problems, and particularly of the reunion with Rome in 519. The influence of that event even on the imperial coinage is established, and—in this connection—an identification of the celebrated Archangel ivory in the British Museum offered, in the masterly Excursus (pp. 418-426).

The chapter on Justin's religious policy (pp. 132-253), however, fails somewhat to bring out all the complexity of the story of Catholicism in the Eastern Empire, subjected to the triple attack of heresy on orthodoxy, caesaropapism on the primacy of the spiritual, and local ecclesiastical ambition on papal authority. Within the empire, reduced now to its eastern moiety, heresy often proved a banner to national separatisms; to counterbalance these, the imperial heirs of pagan Rome, prone to determine the spiritual by the temporal, themselves dabbled in heresy; and court ecclesiastics, subservient to Caesar and jealous of the Pope, brought about, through adherence to their masters' irregularities, the cutting off of the Byzantine Church from the Catholic communion with Rome. In the sixth century Monophysitism, condemned at Chalcedon but espoused by the Egyptians and the Syrians, was still the heresy of the day. The Emperor Zeno and the Patriarch Acacius had attempted in 482 a compromise between it and Catholicism, which satisfied no one (except the Armenians); the court, nevertheless, clung to its politico-dogmatic conception; and the Byzantine Church remained in schism, until Justin (and Justinian), about to inaugurate a western political orientation, decided for orthodoxy. Faithful as ever to Caesar, the Byzantine Church was received back into the Catholic fold—as ever, on Roman terms. The condition of reunion was the adherence to the *Libellus* of Pope St. Hormisdas which proclaimed the primacy and inerrancy of the Apostolic See, the communion with which was the *conditio sine qua non* of belonging to the Church of Christ. It was signed by the patriarch and bishops of the Byzantine Church in 519 and the Acacian schism was ended. To refer to it as the first such breach (pp. 132, 190) is inexact in view of the Arian schism and the Attician and Eutychian breaches that preceded it.

It seems pointless to speculate with others (pp. 207-212), whether or no the reunion of 519 was a "triumph" for the Papacy or to beg the question by stating (pp. 180, cf. 211) that, *if* the Pope hoped to interfere in the political life of the empire as well, he failed—there being no evidence that he ever did so. Actually the reunion meant, first, the return of the empire to papal orthodoxy and, second, the renewed eastern acceptance of the dogmatic and historical fact of papal authority (of which acceptance there are numerous instances before, as well as after, 519 and here S. H. Scott's *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy* might have been found useful). This fact the chapter in question understates considerably. Thus, in one place (p. 105) the reunion is called a "restoration of friendly relations with the Pope" and Pope St. John I's precedence over the Constantinopolitan bishop, when visiting the capital in 526, is qualified as one of "the rare distinctions granted the Pope" (p. 218). As a matter of fact, the Pope had such precedence *ex officio*, both as Pope and as a patriarch. More than that, it will be recalled that *all* the ecclesiastics of the Roman Church enjoyed, at the very imperial court, a precedence over the Byzantine churchmen (cf. *Kletorologion*, III, *ap.* Const. Porphyr. *De cerimoniis*, II, 52). The distinction, by the way, between the Pope's position as head of the Universal Church and that as the first of the patriarchs, so often missed by Easterners, is not grasped in this book: the Patriarch Epiphanius' allusions to coequality (p. 202) can only refer to patriarchal rank, on which his upstart see was naturally anxious to insist. Understating the fact of papal authority obliges our book either to regard its manifestations in Justin's reign as a baffling *deus ex machina*, or to resort to Caspar's unconvincing attempt to explain some of them away (pp. 202-203).

It is true that like all the other reunions that of 519 did not vanquish caesaropapism (cf. pp. 179, 212), as it did heresy, in the empire. Indeed, there were many sincere Catholics in it; and the scenes in Constantinople in July, 518 (their account first englished by Vasiliev, pp. 136-144), as well as the popular enthusiasm in connection with the reunion and with Pope St. John's visit bear testimony to this. Nevertheless, upon the whole it was only on the question of orthodoxy *vs.* heresy that they differed from the party that I should like to denominate the *politiques (pace* Father Dvornik, whose distinction of "extremists" and "moderates" strikes one as rather superficial). To the insidious and underlying caesaropapistic tendency, practically all the Byzantine Christians had succumbed. Thus, supported by the Byzantine Catholics, St. Hormisdas was able to defeat the chief enemy of the day: the compromise of the *Henotikon;* without that support, his successors could not prevail against the enhanced caesaropapism of Justinian; and that tendency, and the increased pretensions of the see of New Rome it nurtured, conjoined later with Hellenic nationalism (replacing the heresies of old), finally led the empire into the Cerularian schism of 1054.

A few additional remarks. The last Armenian Arsacid should be called Artashēs IV, not Ardashir (p. 254). It is somewhat inexact to equate Iberia with Georgia (p. 269); the latter renders *Sakartvelo:* the totality of the Georgian lands, including Lazica; the former, *Kartli* or Eastern Georgia. *Phthasuarsas,* given by Theophanes as the name of Kavādh I's third son (p. 265), is in reality the title—*Padhishkhvār-shāh*—borne by the eldest, Kāūs [cf. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides,* 2nd ed. (1944), p. 353]. In this context, one might wish to see the less familiar Iranian names in the original form, not as the Byzantines disfigured them, as well as a more consistent spelling of Iranian and Armenian names (cf. Asoghig of Taron, Kiracos of Gantzac; Cawades, Kawades, Kawad, pp. 39; 10, 128, 122 etc.). *Antistitum* (p. 201) is "of the bishops," not "of the priests"; and instead of "ordained Bishop" (p. 107), "consecrated bishop" should be written. Finally, one may question the utility of adducing late-mediaeval Russian translations of Byzantine chronicles, which possess no value for the period discussed (pp. 37-38; *passim*), or the propriety of inserting into the narrative of the solemn moments of the reunion of 519 the invectives of an emotional Russian historian of the Church writing in 1915 (pp. 165 n. 52, 174 n. 63, 177, cf. 211).

The great elegance of the publication, the beauty of the plates, no less than the excellence of the study itself—which the above remarks in no way mean to belittle—make of this monograph a welcome and valuable contribution to Byzantine studies.

CYRIL TOUMANOFF

Georgetown University

Histoire de l'église en Belgique. Volumes III and IV. By E. de Moreau, S.J. [Museum Lessianum—Section Historique, Nos. 3 and 12.] (Bruxelles: l'Edition Universelle: Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1945; 1949. Pp. viii, 745; 518. 300 frs. and 275 frs. belges.)

This work continues to appear with dispatch and with eminently satisfying scholarship. Volumes I and II were reviewed here in the issue of July, 1948. A complementary volume in two parts, text and maps, was given notice in the issue of April, 1949. Two more volumes are to appear. Volume III covers the years 1122 to 1378; Volume IV the years 1378 to 1559. Père de Moreau continues to have collaborators. Volume III contains a résumé of Ruysbroeck's spiritual doctrine by J. Maréchal. Volume IV has three chapters on art by J. Lavalleye. The Bollandists Coens and de Gaiffier have helped to make the work a paragon of proof-reading.

The author uses a noticeably rich bibliography in Flemish, or Thiois, as he calls the language. He crams his volumes with facts, but does not fail to supply linking syntheses. Of general interest in the work is the light it throws on the communal struggles. Special emphasis is placed on the unifying effect of the University of Louvain, a great boon in such a dappled country. The account of how Henry VIII sought an opinion on his marital difficulties from the university comes into Volume IV. The adverse opinion of the savants received praise from Luther. Later Luther offered to submit his teachings to the same theological faculty. To his dismay the university proved to be the first international organ to denounce him. He died while writing "against the asses of Louvain," "that damned cesspool." Extant chronicles supply information on the political acts of the Church rather than on pastoral care (III, 72). The Cistercians built large barns miles away from their monasteries (III, Pl. XXI). Belgium has no church edifice in the Renaissance style; Gothic is followed immediately by baroque (IV, 418-419). The authorship of the *Imitatio Christi* still escapes definite solution (IV, 359).

The following typographical slips were noted. Lines thirteen and fourteen should read as one sentence (III, 250). For *trouble* read *troublée* (p. 323, n. 1). For *qu'i la* read *qu'il a* (p. 384). For *quor* read *pour* (p. 473). For *baillage* read *bailliage* (p. 474). For *Léan* read *Léau* (Pl. XXXIV). In the table of contents of Volume IV (p. 515) the chapters are not entered.

CHARLES H. LYNCH

Our Lady of Providence Seminary

Friar Felix at Large. A Fifteenth Century Pilgrimage to the Holy Land. By H. F. M. Prescott. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. 254. $3.75.)

The author of the prize-winning *Spanish Tudor* has written a superbly interesting and scholarly work on pilgrimage in the late Middle Ages. In 1480 and 1483 Friar Felix, a Dominican of Ulm, made pilgrimages to Jerusalem and upon his return from the second one he wrote, for the entertainment of his brethren at Ulm, what he was pleased to call the *Fratris Felicis Fabri Evagatorium in Terram Sanctam.* The work was edited at Stuttgart, in three volumes, between 1843 and 1849, and parts of it have been translated by the Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society. Translating the title *Friar Felix at Large,* Miss Prescott has made Friar Felix the central character of her book and has drawn largely upon his narrative.

But if anyone thinks that this book is a watered-down digest of the friar's writings, he is due for pleasant disillusionment. We have many scholarly works which set down external facts objectively, but from which the life blood has been drained, and we have historical stories into which have been woven the twentieth-century imaginings of creative writers. The author has the happy faculty of combining the objective examination of the sources with the production of a good piece of literature. In her work the fifteenth century lives once more. The genial Friar Felix takes the center of the stage, but we look also within the minds of the bishops, clerics, nuns, and lay people who go on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. We know the captains of the Venetian ships so that, if we were to meet one on the street tomorrow, we would be able to carry on a conversation with him. We could approach the Saracen official in the Holy Land and know how best to conduct ourselves. We have shared the smelly hold of a Venetian ship with men, chickens, and cattle and we have enjoyed quiet, meditative hours alone on the clear, fresh deck. We have drunk stale water and diluted wine, bargained in port for a few loaves of bread, prayed in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. The author has told not only of Felix but of life and travel in the fifteenth century. She has drawn upon the pilgrimages of Margery Kemp in 1413, Canon Pietro Casola in 1494, and some eight others between those dates, and their narratives help to fill in the details in the friar's itinerary.

The misspelling of "Christe eleison" on page 190 and the attribution of lay state to Canon von Breydenbach are very minor errors in this book. Though not in orders, the canon would, by the reception of the tonsure, be a cleric in the full sense of the term. Only for an instant does the author fall into an outmoded nineteenth-century point of view. In discussing the antipathy between the Greeks and the visiting Latins it is said to be no small wonder that the ill feeling of the Latins "was reciprocated" by the Greeks. A thousand years of such history had preceded the visit of Frater Felix to the East and who of us can determine in 1483 who is "starting" and who is "reciprocating"?

This book makes good general reading and is important for the scholar in filling in the picture of the dying Middle Ages.

HENRY A. CALLAHAN

Boston College

Russische Denker. By Bernhard Schultze. (Wien: Herder Verlag. 1950. Pp. 456. $3.25.)

Father Bernhard Schultze, S.J., a professor at the Pontifical Institute for Oriental Studies in Rome, has given us in *Russische Denker* an excellent survey of Russian thought during the past two centuries concerning Christ in His person, the God-Man, Christ in His Mystical Body, the Church, and Christ in His vicar, the Pope.

For years Father Schultze has been a close student of Berdyaev's work; his doctoral dissertation written in German was entitled *The Church as Viewed by Nicholas Berdyaev* (Rome, 1938). In the present work the author has widened his scope, treating in all twenty-four authors: Skovoroda, Tchadaev, Belinsky, Kireevsky, Khomiakov, Danilevsky, Leontiev, Bucharev, Tolstoy, Dostoevski, Fedorov, Rozanov, Gogol, Merezkowsky, Soloviev, Ern, Sergius and Eugene Trubetzkoi, Florensky, Bulgakov, Berdyaev, Shestov, Karsavin, and Ivanov. These particular writers were chosen with design because of the large amount and rich quality of the information they would furnish the author in answer to his question: what did some of the great Russian minds think of Christ? Though one or the other of these thinkers was a priest, none of them represents the official theology of the Russian Orthodox Church; their opinions are, therefore, their personal views. They were members of the comparatively small intellectual class whose thought and writings exerted a considerable influence and helped to shape popular opinion in Russia and among the Russian colonies in exile.

Almost all these thinkers were university graduates, and professionally they were teachers, novelists, poets, publicists, philosophers, or theologians. With the exception of Shestov, who was a Jew, these men were, at least externally, Russian Orthodox Christians. Tolstoy alone expressly denied the divinity of Christ and was, therefore, apart from other reasons, excommunicated from the Russian Church. Belinsky wavered constantly between professing positive faith or atheism. Of the entire group only two, Soloviev and Ivanov, finally found their way into the Roman Catholic Church.

Each essay is prefaced with a brief biographical sketch of the respective author which gives him his proper historical and philosophical setting. Then Father Schultze lets each author speak for himself, and the many quotations offered render the book an anthology of passages concerning the central theme: Christ. It is hardly necessary to say that the figure of Christ emerges with different features from the pens of these various authors. While Christ Himself is almost always treated with deference and respect, and many times with profound devotion and spiritual understanding, the same cannot be said about the treatment accorded the Church (specifically the Roman Church) and the Pope. These distorted and often hostile views concerning the Church and the Papacy are due to varying influences: subjectivism, national pride, personal prejudices, Slavophilism, rationalism, German philosophy, Protestantism, a spirit of liberalism and anarchism, and a desire to be free from all authority.

In the short epilogue Father Schultze naturally points out that the Messianic character of Russia, so loudly proclaimed by the Slavophiles, will be fully realized only in Russia's conversion to Roman Catholicism, a fact which Our Lady of Fatima has assured us will come to pass provided her plea is heeded.

GEORGE J. UNDREINER

Pontifical College Josephinum

The History of the Popes. Volume XXXV. *Benedict XIV (1740-1758).* By Ludwig von Pastor. Translated by E. F. Peeler. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1950. Pp. xliii, 516. $5.00.)

After a nine year interval Herder is tackling the last, the sixteenth, volume of Pastor's German edition. Volume XXXV in the English series is the first, but four more will be needed to finish the job. This particular book studies the reign of Benedict XIV (1740-1758). As we all know, the latter part of the *History of the Popes* was not actually written by Pastor himself but was "rounded off" (to borrow the expression of the foreword) from his notes after he died in 1928. Dr. Wühr and Father Kneller, both of Munich, did most of this work for the present volume.

They carry on in the best Pastor tradition, from the intricate table of contents to the appendix of valuable unprinted documents. All their sentences converge into a portrait of the Pope. Benedict XIV smiles out of the wearisome pages and considers whether he should joke with us or argue theology. But, of course, the portrait includes the whole Church world that pivoted around him. In one corner of the painting Gallicanism and its Spanish and Austrian kindred slowly choke the Supreme Pontiff's authority in their lands. In another, Jansenism through the French parlement tries for the last time to engineer papal recognition and survival. The Jesuits begin their passion in the garden of Paraguay, while the calumnies are such as to make even the Pope wonder about his champions. Rationalism and Freemasonry quietly come to life on the continent while the Holy Father unwittingly commends Voltaire. The ritual disputes in China and Malabar die before the bull *Ex quo.* The Index is revised and art and science flourish in Rome.

As usual, it is a vast and detailed picture that Pastor and his collaborators have painted. Its vastness and detail would, perhaps, overwhelm the beginner, but these very qualities render the work indispensable for the experienced historian. Although the bulk of it is done in the dull, heavy strokes of facts and sources, the artists knew how to color it from time to time with anecdotes and sly humor. E. F. Peeler's translation is typical of the set—not too smooth but satisfactory.

CARL J. STEINBICKER

St. Gregory Seminary
Cincinnati

Window on Maynooth. By Denis Meehan. (Dublin: Clonmore and Reynolds. 1949. Pp. 182. 12/6.)

Seldom has a book been more accurately entitled than this one. It is really what the blurb proclaims: a potted history in which St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, tells its own story through its buildings, their significance, and their customs. Reading this brochure is like traveling through Ireland's oldest seminary with its most competent guide. The travelogue is written in a delightful fashion, missing nothing from the names of the various architects to the intriguing legend of the ghost room. This work is full of out-of-the-way information, most of it available now for the first time. Several historical facts missing in Healy's *Centenary History,* are recorded in this brief volume, characterized by understatements.

Not often has an author been more gifted in the art of description than the present one, a professor and librarian at Maynooth. With a charming sense of humor and a sharp eye for local lore and personality he makes his affection for the place speak through the buildings and the vivid portraits he paints. Interesting and oftentimes humorous items concerning the more important professors and alumni of Maynooth and its traditions have been blended gracefully into this fascinating account.

The author has taken a balanced view wherever he shows his hand on the Anglo-Irish question. It might have been his modesty that kept him from saying more about the high academic standards of Maynooth and its exceptionally fine training in the humanities. The detailed explanation of the British endowment of Maynooth and the mention of the many grants made to the college might mislead the reader into thinking that poor boys in a large number could attend Maynooth. Such is not true and as a result the student body for the most part is drawn from the middle class.

Maynooth has always been blessed with more vocations than the Church in Ireland has needed, and so this institution has given birth to two active missionary groups, the Maynooth Mission to China and the more recent Society of St. Patrick. These two missionary enterprises form one of the brightest pages in the history of this institution which has produced so many exemplary priests and fine leaders in the hierarchy.

It is true that Maynooth-trained priests hold a unique position in Irish civic life that remains to puzzle foreign observers today (p. 17). However, it is this same leading of people "politically as well as spiritually, and ignoring disapproval in high places," that has often made it difficult for Maynooth men to adjust themselves to the priesthood in other lands. It is their tendency to lead people in every aspect of life that has left them open, for example in this country, to the accusation of being rather authoritarian.

There are a few misspellings in this well-printed volume, e.g., hugh for huge (p. 95) and Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis had no "d" in his name and he died in 1896 not in 1866 (p. 93). The volume is enhanced by eleven excellent illustrations and a lengthy essay on the sources.

HUGH J. NOLAN

La Salle College
Philadelphia

The Papacy and European Diplomacy, 1869-1878. By Lillian Parker Wallace. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 349. $6.00.)

The reviewer must admit at the outset that he hesitated for quite some time to discuss Mrs. Wallace's book. The reasons for such an attitude will become clear in the following lines. Professor Wallace, in outlining the diplomatic history of the Papacy during the last period of the reign of Pius IX—a task not before attempted—has based her narrative mainly on such important sources as the *Collectio Lacensis* and the great edition of Bismarck's *Gesammelte Werke,* used for the first time—to the extent of this writer's knowledge—for the analysis of the German attitude toward the Vatican; and it proves to be revealing, indeed, for this purpose. The author also duly availed herself of such printed collections of documents as the *Grosse Politik,* the *Documents diplomatiques,* the *Origines de la guerre de 1870-71,* etc. The bibliographical list is quite impressive, although it could without much difficulty be matched by another one consisting of books Professor Wallace failed to consult and among them would be included such indispensable works as Schmidlin's *Papstgeschichte,* Soderini's *Leo XIII,* Mollat's *Question Romaine,* Mourret's *Histoire générale de l'église,* and, with one or two exceptions, the more recent Italian literature, including also such source material as the correspondence of Lanza, published in the 1930's, for which Tavallini's biography published in 1887, is hardly a substitute. As for the knowledge of articles pertaining to the period discussed, the situation is even worse, but the reviewer does not wish to insist on pedantic details.

Apparently Mrs. Wallace was anxious to penetrate the line adhered to by the printed diplomatic sources, and it is here that her approach must be discussed to some extent. The author tells us that Pius IX "in the beginning was accustomed to go . . . arm in arm with his republican ministers . . ." (p. 5). The reviewer admits that he has not the slightest idea to which of the ministers this reference may apply; the source is Johann Friedrich's *Tagebuch während des vaticanischen Concils* (1873); Friedrich who joined the Old Catholics was excommunicated in 1872; his diary, hardly very reliable, certainly is biased in an extreme degree. In the lengthy discussion on the Vatican Council the attitude taken by Professor Wallace is close to that of Lord Acton on the same subject; once more there is the opposing of the "brilliant" and "scholarly" minority, led mainly by the Germans, to the ignorant Italian and Spanish bishops. No mention is made of the fact that while the Germans excelled in historical studies they were inferior to their opponents in systematic theology. A good number of references for the narrative of the Vatican Council give as a source *Ce qui se passe au Concil.* This anonymous account, published in May, 1870, was considered by the members of the council to be so biased that it was singled out for special mention in a protest made by them (cf. p. 108); Friedrich calls it a specially malicious book; Ollivier, whom the author uses frequently, refers to it as being "a lampoon rather than a history"; but Professor Wallace without a word of criticism or justification, uses it along with Goyau, Bury, Dupanloup, Butler, Purcell, and Granderath, who (II, 554 ff.) discusses *Ce qui se passe* in highly unfriendly terms. The famous Strossmayer incident is told on the basis of the Friedrich *Diary* (p. 94), while Granderath's work, though avowedly Catholic but based on detailed source studies, is referred to only incidentally. It is not easy to understand why Döllinger's attitude during the council should be described as having been "above suspicion and criticism" (p. 54) and identified with that of Bishop Hefele, while the results to which these attitudes led were so different. Professor Wallace chooses to say that Döllinger had been educated in his scientific tradition by Görres. Lord Acton, in an unpublished note, jotted down: "Doellinger's teachers if they did little for his faculties, did much for his prejudices."

The reader will wonder why the author is perplexed that Hungary had no diplomatic representation of its own (p. 107) since in the Compromise of 1867 foreign policy and diplomatic representation were kept among the few agenda common to both parts of the dual monarchy. It is not easy to see how the Italian government could have used the liberty of action stipulated in the September Convention (1864) to occupy the Pope's temporal possessions (p. 121); actually the Italian government pledged itself in this convention not to embark on nor to permit such an occupation. Concerning the "enthusiastic demonstrations" which occurred all over Italy after the occupation of Rome, one may recall the report of the British consul in Civitavecchia who, when in those days similar events took place, described the town as full of flags: "every partisan hoisted two for joy, every opponent out of fear hoisted four . . . The same disorderly proceedings and the same class of persons to ferment them, were occupied there as afterwards in Rome." It is likewise surprising to find a reference to Lamennais "as the great scholar" (p. 153) and to Friedrich as "one of the very prominent German theologians" (p. 156).

The beginnings of the *Kulturkampf* are carefully described, but the importance of the Old Catholic movement is overstressed. To assume that either Chancellor Hohenlohe (p. 233) or Döllinger (p. 320) joined them is erroneous. The religious attitude of Bismarck has been studied by German scholars with results very different from those reached by Mrs. Wallace (p. 208). On the other hand, Cavour's attitude toward the Papacy—if analyzed on the basis of his *Carteggio*—certainly appears less innocuous than the author presents it (p. 263). Nor is there much reason to agree with the statement made on the same page that an arrangement made between the Quirinal and the Vatican would have made the relations between Italy and France void of the main source of friction, for Crispi surely was antagonistic to the Pope as well as to France.

The scandalous stories concerning Cardinal Antonelli related (p. 295 f.) on the basis of Sigmund Müntg's gossiping *Aus Quirinal und Vatican* (Berlin, 1891), in no way answer the more relevant question as to the historical importance of the papal Secretary of State who like Consalvi and Bernetti never was ordained a priest. Cardinal Franchi did not die in February, 1878 (p. 318), but became Leo XIII's first Secretary of State. The Archbishops of Cologne and Posen, deposed during the *Kulturkampf* never "received their offices again" (p. 322), but resigned in 1885 and 1886, respectively. It is not correct to assume that St. Peter reigned twenty-five years (p. 315), since the year of his death is not known. It seems almost incredible that an event on which so much source material has been published as the visit of William II to the Pope in 1888 should be misrepresented as it is (p. 323). However, the reason is clear since Professor Wallace, instead of basing herself on such studies as Soderini or Crispolti-Aureli, preferred the gossip of De Cesare.

One final remark may be added. The author is apparently fond of such expressions as "the wave ot *mystical, fanatical* religious feeling which swept . . . especially France" after the loss of the temporal power (p. 157); "the wave of *fanatical* devotion was reaching its climax in the pilgrimages to the shrines and in the action of the French assembly in planning a church to be located on Montmartre" (p. 212); and "the *hysterical* wave of *religious fanaticism* swept the masses in France and induced them to undertake pilgrimages to holy shrines" (p. 239). (Italics the reviewer's.)

FRIEDRICH ENGEL-JANOSI

The Catholic University of America

Daniel Mannix, Archbishop of Melbourne. By Frank Murphy. (Melbourne: Advocate Press. 1948. Pp. vi, 258. 15/s.)

Since Archbishop Mannix is still with us and will be, we hope, for many years, it is much too soon for even a popular biography. It will be long after his death before it will be possible to place him in his proper setting against the background of his great achievements for the Church in Australia. But it is not too soon to seem to say that he is the outstanding figure in the ecclesiastical history of Australia in the first half of this century and probably since the time of Ullathorne. His personal attainments, his background, and his ecclesiastical formation in Maynooth had marked him out, so it seemed, for a distinguished academic career culminating, in the ordinary course of events, in some major Irish diocese. There was some surprise when he was suddenly moved from Maynooth to Melbourne as coadjutor to Archbishop Carr. If any justification or explanation were required, it was quickly supplied by the exceptional administrative talents he revealed. The people of Melbourne and all Australia soon recognized that in the young bishop they possessed a man whose singular gifts of mind and spirit were controlled and directed by a well-balanced temperament and a strong grasp of practical affairs. Tall and commanding in appearance, carefully educated both in theology and literature, gifted with notable eloquence and possessed of a strong sense of the duty of a bishop to instruct and lead his people in the major concerns of life, he quickly assumed a leadership in Australian Catholic affairs that has been strengthened through the years. He has had the courage to take an unpopular stand on more than one occasion and has not repined when called upon to pay a high price for the freedom and vigor with which he has expressed his views. At the same time he has won national recognition as the spokesman of his people. Their loyalty to him has expressed itself in the solid support they have given to all the projects he has undertaken for the promotion of Catholic interests in Australia. The battle for justice for the Catholic schools, provision for the higher education of the clergy and the laity, the development and strengthening of a sound and lively lay apostolate, the effort to make Catholic ideals and principles felt in every level of Australian life have absorbed most of his time and attention. But he has never ceased to work for closer links between Australian Catholics and the Catholics of Europe and the United States, especially in the intellectual field. The most recent example of this is the use to which he has put the purse presented to him on the occasion of the sixtieth anniversary of his priesthood. He has established a trust fund to provide for the graduate training of Australian priests in European and American universities. Mr. Murphy has given us a series of studies of some of the archbishop's activities in the period of almost forty years since his arrival in Melbourne. The reader will find in them the portrait of a great archbishop who can be ranked with our own John Glennon and John Hughes.

JOSEPH P. CHRISTOPHER

The Catholic University of America

Cardinal Mindszenty Speaks. Published by order of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, Prince-Primate of Hungary. Introduction by Akos Zombory. (New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1949. Pp. xi, 224. $2.50.)

On December 27, 1948, the Communist Minister of Interior of the Soviet-controlled government of Hungary issued the following communique: "Joseph Mindszenty, Archbishop of Esztergom, was taken into custody by the police authorities on suspicion of treason, crimes aimed at the overthrow of the Republic, espionage and currency speculation." After six weeks of imprisonment during which the cardinal was kept incommunicado, he was tried by a "people's court" and was found guilty of the suspected charges and sentenced to life imprisonment.

An astonished world soon learned, however, that one-half hour before his arrest the cardinal wrote this statement on an old envelope:

> I have partaken in no conspiracy whatsoever. I shall not resign my episcopal see. I shall not make any confession. If, however, despite this you should read that I confessed or that I resigned, and even see it authenticated by my signature thereto, regard that as merely the consequence of human frailty; and in advance I declare such acts null and void.

Furthermore, in February, 1949, soon after the trial, a book appeared in Switzerland which contained a collection of documents selected by the cardinal, which "he desired to have made public in foreign countries in case of his anticipated arrest." *Cardinal Mindszenty Speaks* is the American edition of that book. The publishers took special precaution in authenticating the documents and comparing them with the original Hungarian documents which they now possess.

The book has a short historical introduction; the carefully selected documents are presented in five groups, organized topically and in chronological order, and linked together by descriptive and explanatory notes by the editor; there is an appendix of hitherto unpublished material and a list of unimportant documents omitted from the text. The case of the cardinal is fully stated. The documents unfold the heroic story of resistance by Mindszenty first to the Nazi and then to Communist oppression. He raised his voice every time natural rights were attacked by the Soviet-controlled Hungarian government and reminded those who paid lip-service to democracy, that "the cornerstone of true democracy is the recognition of the fact that all natural rights are inviolable and that no human power can alter or invalidate them." He also opposed the Soviet sponsored land reform law which confiscated large and small estates as an "act of vengeance, bent upon the total destruction of a particular class of society," and because this confiscation did not benefit the poor, but "was motivated by party politics" and prepared the establishment of the *kolhoz,* the collective farm. He protested as well against the hastily promulgated matrimonial law by which "the government greatly overstepped its authority and deeply wounded the feelings of the Christian population, by questioning the principle of indissolubility of marriage . . . a vital core of natural law." He raised his voice against the suppression of Catholic associations and youth organizations ordered by the government on the pretext that they were the hot-beds of reactionary activities. The cardinal reminded the puppets of Moscow, that those "for whom everything Catholic spells reaction, had better look for reactionism in those quarters in which all freedom is oppressed." But his strongest voice was raised against the confiscation of the parochial schools and all Catholic educational institutions, against the establishment of the government-controlled general school with prescribed Marxian textbooks and a Godless curriculum, against the expulsion of religious educators—priests, brothers, nuns—from those venerable institutions of learning which "the Orders, Catholic societies and individual Catholics have founded throughout the centuries." These documents, selected by Cardinal Mindszenty, convincingly present a great prelate, a good patriot and citizen, a fearless follower of Christ. The cardinal is fully vindicated.

Our mild criticism concerns the editing of the volume. The historical introduction is weak and for historians and scholars of little use because of the omission of footnotes and references. This lack of footnoting lessens at times the effective use of some of the documents in which reference is made to matters with which only specialists in Hungarian history can be familiar. It is to be regretted that for such important documents the publishers did not secure the services of a historian.

TIBOR KEREKES

Georgetown University

AMERICAN CHURCH HISTORY

The Catholic Church in the United States. By Theodore Roemer, O.F.M.Cap. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1950. Pp. viii, 444. $5.00.)

The author of this volume is to be congratulated for producing the first textbook for the study of the history of the Catholic Church in the United States. Theodore Maynard in *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York, 1941) did not pretend to write such a work, although his survey was another pioneering effort which many will continue to prefer, despite its shortcomings, to the volume of Father Roemer. [Cf. the review by Leo F. Stock in this REVIEW, XXVIII (April, 1942), 94-103.] The publisher has provided the wide margins and paragraph headings which are the hallmarks of collegiate texts and the treatment is divided into four parts characterized by the terms: Missions, Integration, Assimilation, and Maturity, which all together make up twenty-two chapters. This much has definitely been accomplished by the work, that no longer is there any excuse for the history of the American Church being neglected in the seminaries of our country. Up to this time it has not been uncommon to have a sketchy survey given to it in a few weeks, or at best a few months, although it is certainly worthy of a full year course. Let the professors trained in other fields of the history of the Church take heart from this new outline. They may enjoy using it, for with some side reading and the application of their history-sharpened wits they will be able to indulge in a favorite teacher's sport of picking flaws in the text.

This reviewer would find fault principally with the two-fold mould into which the author attempted to pour his facts, viz., a chronological one, the attempt to tell the story after 1780 by decades, and secondly, an ideological one, the emphasis on a peculiar American loyalty to the Holy See which is taken to mean the omniscence of Roman officialdom. There are some strange results. The chapter on the decade, 1870-1880, e.g., is called "Echoes of the Kulturkampf," but it deals almost entirely with Indian and Negro mission activity going well beyond that period. No mention is made therein of the troubled American 1870's with their impact on the Church in the national sensation of the Molly Maguire affair and the financial scandal of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. Nor does the first appearance of American prelates at an ecumenical council win more than a brief paragraph. Again the chapter on the 1880's is called, "The School Question," although the most complete monograph on that subject is dated, 1891-1893. The rather deceptive title, "Charity" is used to cover the years, 1820-1830, which is given over to the origins of the mission aid societies of Europe which the author treats with the competence of one who has made that area his specialty. It must be remembered, of course, that Father Roemer had no guide in the difficult problem of arranging his materials and it is to be hoped that others who may follow will profit by his experience.

The sources for this text are naturally secondary works. In this regard to refer to the bibliography of the subject treated as too vast to list in its entirety is a wise move. The Ellis listing [*A Select Bibliography of the History of the Catholic Church in the United States,* (New York, 1947)] of 775 titles, however, is better referred to as "select," not because it dared not pose as complete (p. iv) but because printed materials were not included which were not considered of at least some value to serious history. An exception is made in the volume at hand to include a *relatio* of the Reverend Peter M. Abbelen on the German question of the mid-1880's and this is apparently the only primary source utilized. The last chapters of the book rely heavily on the *National Catholic Almanac.* There are three appendices, which are made up of lists of vicariates apostolic, archdioceses, and dioceses and the names of their incumbents, and finally of ecclesiastical provinces and their suffragans numbered by order of founding. These are to be used in connection with three maps which are blank except for numbers and which are placed earlier in the book, making both sets of items of dubious value. The index is adequate but on a few tries revealed itself not too accurate in the matter of page numbers.

Specifically noted were the following questionable statements which touch particularly some aspects of the American Catholic story which were not well covered by the works of Shea or Guilday: the minor seminary of St. Charles was first established by the Sulpicians near Ellicott City, not Catonsville, and remained in that location until it burned down in 1911 (p. 127); the Jesuit Van Quickenborne's name should be Charles Felix, not Frederick (p. 165); "too energetic for his own good," is a poor description of the personal troubles of Detroit's first bishop (p. 183); Great Britain can hardly be said to have been "coerced" in the American diplomatic victory of 1846 over the Oregon boundary (p. 205); the Philadelphia seminary was not burned down during the nativist riots of 1844 (p. 218); there is no evidence that "bigotry" killed the still rather mysterious mission which was proposed to John Hughes during the Mexican War (p. 219); episcopal favor on temperance societies would have to be qualified to mean only Catholic ones (p. 221); the establishment of a nunciature in Washington was not merely "thought with good reason" to be part of the motive for Archbishop Bedini's ill-fated trip of 1853 (p. 242); there is no evidence that Archbishop Hughes refused "an official mission as ambassador" when going as northern envoy to Europe during the Civil War (p. 249); the papal reply to Jefferson

Davis' letter was penned December 3, 1863, and not written in reply to any message carried by Bishop Lynch in the spring of 1864 (p. 250); the Society of the Divine Word Seminary is at Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, not Louisiana (p. 279); Bishop Sepiacci's appointment to preside over the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore had gone beyond the stage of papal "intention" when Gibbons and his colleagues made the American opposition felt (p. 286); the Knights of Labor were saved from Roman condemnation only in the United States (cf. pp. 282, 300, 302, where this important case is merely alluded to); controversy over the condemnation of specific secret societies continued into the twentieth century and not merely up to 1894 (p. 297); all—and not some—of the American archbishops protested the erection of a nunciature in the United States in the 1880's (p. 302); Father McGlynn was excommunicated by Rome, not by Archbishop Corrigan of New York (pp. 302, 307); the change from "Council" to "Conference" in the title of the N.C.W.C. came in 1922 not 1927 (p. 360).

Perhaps more serious than mistakes of fact, although usually easier to detect, are the colorings of the author's own mind. May not a certain bias account for the suppression of the not very edifying but still highly important story of Antonio Sedella, O.F.M.Cap., who reigned in New Orleans both officially and unofficially from 1785 to 1829, with the exception of five years? One wonders, too, at the linking of the Capuchin Order with the Society of the Divine Word as especially active for the American Negro, although Father Roemer may have had their work in Milwaukee in mind (p. 279). Anti-Catholicism is just plain and simple "bigotry" throughout this volume with little attempt to explain it in terms of a tradition dating from colonial times or a phenomenon influenced by economic and social factors. The New Deal moved perceptibly towards "the principles of Marxian socialism" (p. 370). It may not be too far afield to note that even the Brooklyn *Tablet* linked part of the Roosevelt platform with "Christian social justice" (July 29, 1933). The ideas of the so-called "liberal" wing of the hierarchy of the late nineteenth century are dubbed "super-democratic" (p. 320). There are other jejune judgments, e.g., that John A. Ryan was made the bishops' spokesman. This is hardly true even though the program of social reconstruction which he penned in 1919 came out under their name. It is hardly warranted to conclude from the issuing of the episcopal statement of 1940 that "the hierarchy took an active part in all these matters of social justice" (p. 371). And in this connection the Social Action Department of the N.C.W.C. might well have been mentioned, along with other less official groups such as the Association of Catholic Trade Unionists, for their work in labor-management relations; but instead this division of the N.C.W.C. is described as "using all means at its disposal to bring about universal peace!" (p. 396). On one and the same page you can read that the Vatican Council was called "to prepare the way for the struggle against all the tendencies toward materialism," and that it was the "sympathy of the common people of Europe" which prevented European intervention in our Civil War (p. 247). For an excess in ultramontanist tone one might try the passage on the Chicago Eucharistic Congress of 1926 to the effect that, "This loyalty was directed through the Supreme Pontiff to the Holy Eucharist in profound manifestations of faith and in glorious pageant . . ." (p. 358).

Probably every reader will find omissions according to his own taste, interest, or even section of the nation. The Catholic attempts at colonizing in the author's own Middle West seem a surprising oversight. The story of the sisterhoods, on the other hand, are given in great detail and appear in the narrative so frequently as to seem to be given much more than the actual twenty pages which in all they comprise.

Father Roemer's volume will in general be handy for ready reference on such matters as dates and names, but as a textbook it is far from perfect and represents only a beginning in that field. The dry bones have not been given life in the fashion of the vision of Ezechiel. In fact, the old section of the boneyard has only been slightly rearranged and even the new bones are sometimes exceedingly dry.

HENRY J. BROWNE

The Catholic University of America

Jesuit and Savage in New France. By J. H. Kennedy. [Yale Historical Publications, No. 50] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. x, 206. $3.75.)

One of the stock illustrations of the "natural man" in the arguments of both eighteenth-century French rationalists and romanticists was the American Indian. For the school of Voltaire he represented man in the pure state of rational existence; for the school of Rousseau he represented man in his supposedly original state of untrammeled freedom. For both schools he was a handy argument against Church and State, their use as well as their abuse, in pre-revolutionary France.

Dr. Kennedy essays in the book under review to discover the origin of this literary character, the "noble savage," this abstract "good pagan," who bore relatively little resemblance to the real Indian, but who was a mighty attractive young heathen. He advances the paradoxical thesis that the "noble Indian" concept, although finally developed and used by open enemies of the Catholic Church in their arguments against Church and all authority, was derived basically from the portrait of the American Indian sketched by Catholic missionaries to New France, particularly the Jesuits.

From the time that the Jesuit Fathers Biard and Massé came to Port Royal in Acadia in 1611 and began to work among the Algonquins, down to the time of Jesuit Father Charlevoix, who spent six years in the early eighteenth century laboring and traveling in New France, missionaries wrote voluminous records of their experiences, in memoirs, tracts, and especially the famous Jesuit *Relations,* for the purpose of interesting French readers back home in giving them support in their effort to convert the redskin to Catholicism. A great deal of space in these accounts was devoted to picturing the savages whom the missionaries were trying to convert and to justifying the effort spent to bring the faith to them. In the process of painting this portrait, the missionaries (predisposed, thinks Dr. Kennedy by their own theological preoccupation with what man can do by his own natural powers) devoted particular attention to the many natural virtues which the natives manifested and which seemed to promise a good foundation for their acceptance of supernatural truth.

It was inevitable that in describing such natural virtues, the priests should have indicated incidentally the contrast between the virtue of these savages and the vices of many supposedly civilized people in France. Before many decades the extensive French reading public had become accustomed through these misisonary writings to think of the Indian as exemplifying all that was best in primitive pagan society. Rationalists and romanticists soon realized that this abstraction was a ready-made illustration for their arguments for reason as opposed to dogma and law, and freedom as opposed to authority.

Dr. Kennedy has based his work on a careful study of the pertinent literature. Some criticisms are in order, however. His analysis of Jesuit theology, while in general correct, becomes confusing and inexact in its brief analysis of *scientia media* (p. 8). One would have preferred, on page 90, at least an allusion to the fact that there are two contradictory versions of the death of Father Sebastian Rasles, neither completely acceptable. The word "genealogical" is misspelled (p. 154), and "St. Malo" (p. 29) is wrongly printed with an accent. And on page 62 the author follows Thwaites, partially at least, in mis-translating "brave maitresse" as "brave woman," instead of "worthy school-mistress" or "preceptress." It will be evident, nevertheless, that these are minor flaws in a thorough, objective, and cogent study of the fascinating development of a famous literary type.

ROBERT F. MCNAMARA

St. Bernard's Seminary

Sisters of St. Joseph of Philadelphia. A Century of Growth and Development, 1847-1947. By Sister Maria Kostka Logue. (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 380, $5.00.)

This history of the Congregation of the Sisters of Saint Joseph of Philadelphia is the result of the research and writings of four Sisters of Saint Joseph, whose work was edited by Sister Maria Kostka Logue. The narrative begins with a brief account of the founding of the congregation in France and its history down to the time when Mother Saint John Fontbonne sent six sisters from the Lyons foundation to the United States to work in the Diocese of Saint Louis. The sisters arrived in this city on March 25, 1836. Eleven years later, at the request of Bishop Francis P. Kenrick, four sisters left for Philadelphia to take charge of Saint John's Orphanage. As the years passed the congregation expanded its work and undertook a great variety of duties. They took charge of elementary schools, opened academies, established a college, staffed hospitals, worked with the deaf and dumb, nursed the sick during epidemics, and cared for soldiers in military hospitals during the Civil War. Meanwhile they underwent all the vicissitudes and achieved the successes that accompany the development of any vigorous and devout religious congregation. A truly remarkable expansion in the number of community members demanded the construction of accommodations that strained the congregation's financial resources. The building of Chestnut Hill College was a courageous venture that called for the assumption of a tremendous financial burden. Disasters, such as fires and the collapse of faultily constructed buildings, occurred. The requests for the services of the sisters, both within the Diocese of Philadelphia and in other dioceses, far exceeded the number of available sisters. But each situation was dealt with successfully under the inspiration of confidence in God and the protection of Saint Joseph. By 1944 the original community of four had expanded to 1,900 sisters who were located in 128 missions in various eastern states.

To compile a history of this kind requires an enormous amount of work. The sisters who were assigned the duty of gathering material for this history have done an excellent piece of work. The research has been extensive and thorough. They have sought and extensively investigated every avenue of approach. Their appraisals of various characters and events are objective and honest. A good part of the history is made up of a simple, narrative account of the development of the congregation under the direction of successive mothers general.

I do, however, find one definite defect. The first ten chapters were, apparently, written as a series of independent essays upon various aspects of the congregation's early history. They have been incorporated into the volume with little or no editing. The result is a large amount of confusing repetition. It would have been far better to have used the fine material in these chapters to construct a coherent and progressive account of the congregation's first years in Philadelphia.

EDWARD T. HARRINGTON

Regis College

Hands to the Needy. By Sister Mary Pauline Fitts, G.N.S.H. (New York: Doubleday and Co. 1950. Pp. xiii, 336. $3.00.)

The story of Venerable Mother Marguerite d'Youville comes to life in the telling by Sister Mary Pauline whose work places the English reading public in her debt. As the author remarks in the preface and verifies in her bibliography, there is a wealth of material on the foundress of the Grey Nuns in French but relatively little in English. The present biography is a welcome contribution. The record of what the valiant Mother d'Youville did with her precious gift of seventy years of life makes the book timely for all of us.

In little more than a year, October 15, 1951, the 250th anniversary of the birth of Marguerite Lajemmerais in the village of Varennes, Quebec, will be commemorated. She was born at a time when France was extending her control in North America and in that expansion the relatives of Marguerite played no minor role. As the oldest of six children, Marguerite, a child of seven, realized beyond her years what the sudden death of her father meant to the welfare of the family. Home conditions during her girlhood developed her native powers and provided a sound training for her future work. Her promising marriage at twenty-one to François d'Youville was yet another training period, but in the school of the cross. Out of the struggle with poverty and personal suffering, broadened and deepened, came the new "Apostle to the Poor."

Sister Mary Pauline has grouped the seventeen chapters of her story in three divisoins: "The Way" covers the early life, marriage, and the bitter years which closed with the death of François; "The Truth" deals with the beginning of Mother d'Youville's volunteer works of charity and the founding of a group of consecrated women who would second her efforts and carry on in the future; "The Life" records the work and well-merited success of the Grey Nuns on three continents with a close-up of the spiritual leader who, after two centuries, still walks at the head of her congregation inspiring its members to the ever greater works for which our own times call.

The volume is provided with an adequate index. An appendix includes important documents of 1849 and 1890 bearing on the introduction of the cause of Mother d'Youville for beatification. Possibly for prudential reasons no reference is made to the present status of the cause, but a briefing on this would have been satisfying to the uninformed admirers of this great American foundress.

SISTER M. ROSALITA KELLY

Marygrove College

The Catholic University of America, 1903-1909. The Rectorship of Denis J. O'Connell. By Colman J. Barry, O.S.B. (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 298. $3.50.)

With this publication we have the fourth, and regrettably the last for a time, of a series of works on the Catholic University of America which began brilliantly with Ellis' *The Formative Years* (Washington, 1946) and which has been brought up to 1909 by Dr. Ellis' students.

This volume maintains the standard set by its predecessors and with them makes it possible for those who are interested in the cause of higher Catholic education to understand what the University has cost in terms of the life-efforts of the founders, rectors, faculties, and administrators of this great institution. We who are fortunate enough to see the University at the peak of its growth should read the record of its founding. In the first three chapters of this volume we see it reach the very nadir of its fortunes. When Monsignor O'Connell took over the rectorship in 1903, fourteen years after the opening of classes, the classes had shrunk to nearly no attendance, the faculty was suffering from internal dissensions that amounted to demoralization, and the curtain was to rise on a financial disaster that in any other institution would probably have meant the end. That it did not mean the end for the institution in Washington was due to the earnestness and loyalty of many people, the chancellor, Cardinal Gibbons, the trustees clerical and lay, the generous priests and people of the United States. Among these, however, those best in a position to know attributed great credit to the third rector, whose administration is here given by Father Barry.

The story of these years has been unearthed in considerable detail from the various sources: the University Archives, the correspondence of O'Connell, the Baltimore Cathedral Archives, etc. The details have been given with the careful respect for the purposes of history which is characteristic of the school of writers who have collaborated here. They have all been inspired with the desire to get the truth before the reader. There is fulness of detail, there is a sensible frankness about the difficulties, the disagreements and the like, the clashes of personal views which went into the troubles of those years. There is nothing whatever of the sensational, no spirit of debunking, no cheap and violent partisanship. The writer understands as Virgil did about Rome "quantae molis erat" to put so great an enterprise upon a firm foundation. In the problems and crises that arose those responsible for the enterprise looked upon its future with differing philosophies according to their differing personalities and experiences. It would be useless, not to say impossible, to write about the matter at all without dealing with these questions. It is a pleasure to see that these questions are treated with the honesty of the scholar and with none of the rashness of the *frondeur*.

O'Connell came to Washington with a remarkable background. It was regrettable, but perhaps at that day unavoidable, that university life was not a part of that background. This led to certain troubles which on balance were not atoned for in O'Connell's mind by his remarkable success in other ways. He had what seemed to the lovers of the University then, and what seems to us in retrospect, an inadequate concept of the University's role in lay education. But others who understood that side better were able to make their views tell. Nevertheless, he did care for what he saw the University to be. Those who worked hardest for it in its time of financial crisis gave the rector a great share of the credit for what was accomplished in what must have been a terrible period. And his own brilliant personality as well as his broad understanding of the need for the University to become known to the public lent a great deal to the success of those who sought to make it be as well as seem the keystone of Catholic education in our country. In a period of dissension among able but strong-minded personalities he was able to reassert unity and to make good the standing of the institution in the eyes of the hierarchy and of the American Catholic public. It was no mean achievement, and Father Barry gives the reader an interesting and satisfactory account of it all.

While recognizing the great merits of this study we hope it will not seem ungracious to point out a fault that is very natural to one who has put in long hours of research. It is a temptation to put into circulation *all* your notes. For example, in dealing with the new project of the annual collection too many quotations are given of the very similar remarks of clergy, bishops, journalists, etc., in its support. Similar examples might be given which detract from reader interest. Again there is a certain carelessness of style and syntax. "Sufficient enough" should have been caught up before the final copy was typed. Professors are not "hired" except in jocose language. Occasionally good will gets in the way of exactitude. Caldwell and McMahon Halls are described as "well-planned, large and in good taste." Not all the adjectives are well chosen.

These, however, are slight blemishes and do not prevent us from congratulating Father Barry on adding a very important chapter to the history of the American Church. Let us at the same time add a word of gratitude to the Department of History which is among the very first at the Catholic University of America in the carrying out of the dream for which so much was done and sacrificed in the years described in these volumes. Could Keane or Gibbons or O'Connell return we are sure they would see in this work alone much justification of the hopes for which they fought so gallantly in the Korean days of the University.

John K. Cartwright

St. Matthew's Cathedral
Washington

A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York. Volume V. *The Rectorship of Dr. Morgan Dix.* Compiled and edited by John A. Dix and Leicester C. Lewis. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 316. $5.00.)

Established more than a quarter of a millennium ago for the worship of God in the Anglican tradition, Trinity Church, situated on Broadway at the head of Wall Street in the heart of New York's great financial district, has remained a prominent landmark and a center of influence in the affairs of the city that grew around it. Four earlier volumes traced the history of this ancient Episcopal church from its beginnings in 1697 down to 1862 and the death of its eighth rector, Dr. William Berrian. The volume under review covers the forty-six eventful years of the rectorship of Dr. Morgan Dix (1862-1908), during which time six new congregations were added to the parish and numerous charitable works inaugurated for the poor and neglected of the city. Fundamental in the churchmanship of this ninth rector of Trinity was the influence of the Tractarian Movement, the great revival in the Church of England associated with the Oxford of Keble, Newman, and Pusey. Although not the pioneer of the so-called high church movement in the United States, Morgan Dix became the outstanding figure in it, and Trinity the church most closely identified with its ritualistic revival.

One regrets that the difficult task of collating and editing the materials for an adequate and scholarly history of Dix's rectorate has not been done more skillfully. The narrative is often tedious with repetitious details, while the injudicious use of laudatory vignettes of leading personalities renders unpalatable other sections of the book. Occasionally the proportions seem open to question; and all too frequently the chapter headings are misleading, e.g., Chapter IX, entitled "The New Mission House and Various Anniversaries," devotes barely a line to the mission house (p. 138) and mentions only one anniversary. Lack of space makes it impossible to discuss here the author's affirmations of the Church of England's right to the title of "Holy, Catholic and Apostolic," or to his references to the Church of Rome and its "distortions and abuses of ancient truth" (p. 271). Suffice it to say, that having eschewed the formality of historical documentation for such assertions, the author makes no effort to relate such "facts" to particular sources. In general, the scanty use of footnotes and the absence of bibliography suggest a rather perfunctory interest in the usual apparatus of scholarship. The index is serviceable, but little profit is to be derived from reading the appendix material. Typographically superior, this volume is not likely to be surpassed in attractiveness of format by many parochial histories in the United States.

Mother Mary Peter Carthy

College of New Rochelle

GENERAL HISTORY

A History of Spain from the Beginnings to the Present Day. By Rafael Altamira. Translated by Muna Lee. (New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc. 1949. Pp. xxx, 748. $6.75.)

This is a translation of the second edition of Professor Altamira's *Manual de historia de España* (Buenos Aires, 1946), written for the lay reader, and it covers the history of Spain from prehistoric times to our own days. What a magnificent sweep of time it records, and what a multitude of problems it poses for the historian who must limit his narrative to the size of a single book! Obviously, the author was not able (nor was he expected) to touch upon everything, or to speak more fully upon what he chose to write about; but he has made a remarkably good selection, and he has given the reader, on the whole, a splendid picture of a great country.

The author has wisely avoided the temptation of looking upon Spanish history as nothing more than politics (a temptation into which other historians have fallen). As a consequence, he has also a great deal to say about the sociological, economic, diplomatic, artistic, religious, constitutional, and imperial aspects of Spanish history, all of which gives his story a roundness that it would not otherwise have had. At the same time, he has not written simply a history of Castile, but rather a history of Spain as a whole, with large sections of it devoted to the peninsular kingdoms that were eventually absorbed by Castile. Occasionally we get an evidence of the typically Castilian habit of looking upon the peninsula as a geographical unity and of considering Portugal, within this frame of reference, as something of a traitor for having refused, on the political level, to follow the example that nature has apparently provided on the geographical. Yet in general, whenever Portuguese history overlaps his own story, Dr. Altamira treats it with more objectivity than one is accustomed to expect from a Spaniard. Unfortunately, he did not use the same sound canons in discussing the present regime in Spain. We know that Dr. Altamira has suffered the adventure of exile—he is now living in Mexico—and we can appreciate the personal reasons for his dislike of Franco. But even these facts in the life of this distinguished historian do not give him the liberty (which he has taken) of treating Franco with prejudice.

As regards the translation, Miss Lee's work represents a labor of love of very large proportions. It is, however, a pity that an otherwise excellent job should be marred here and there by a recurrence of Hispanicized foreign words that should have been given in the first original, e.g., Santa Catalina (for Santa Catarina), and by the awkward handling of certain proper names (which have well-known English equivalents), e.g., St. Domingo de Guzmán. There are also numerous typographical errors. As regards the illustrations, they have not always been judiciously chosen, nor have they always been reproduced with the technical perfection that one has a right to expect.

Despite these historical and mechanical faults, the book that Dr. Altamira and Miss Lee have made available to the English-speaking public will fill a need that has long been felt. Through its pages, the reader will get at least an idea of the extent of Spain's contributions to the civilization of the Occident. At this juncture of world history, particularly, the lessons of the history of Spain are not of the kind that we can afford to overlook.

MANOEL CARDOZO

The Catholic University of America

Germany, 2000 Years. By Kurt F. Reinhardt. (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. xxii, 765. $8.50.)

Although encyclopedic of content, one does not tire of reading this book. What is more important, however, the treatment of the history of the German peoples is thoroughly objective throughout. Because of this virtue the author stops short of "the revolution of nihilism"—the Nazi period, World War II, the defeat and prostration of Germany. It is all "of too recent date to be seen and evaluated in its true proportions and to permit the detached objectivity required for an historical analysis" (p. 675). Nevertheless, Dr. Reinhardt does venture a paragraph on the "iron rule" of Hitler. Doubtless he wrote from experience. Certainly he wrote from a full knowledge of how a *totalstaat* could come into being. Its genesis he had traced in many chapters and parts of chapters dealing with the religious, philosophical, economic, sociological, literary, artistic, and scientific developments in the German lands as well as in those of other European peoples. Seldom are movements discussed as confined to Germany. Many times, too, the thinking and writing of proponents are presented briefly and evaluated critically in the light of pertinent biographical data.

Naturally, we cannot always agree with what Professor Reinhardt says. He may be pardoned for spanning the Middle Ages in less than 200 pages in order to make room for the more recent centuries. However, Byzantine influence on western art seems too heavily weighted. Bernward of Hildesheim, e.g., manifested the spirit of his own folk even in his *Kleinkunst,* although he had every reason to be much affected by the eastern, standing as he did in close relationship with Theophano and her Byzantinizing son, Otto III. Again, were the monks predominantly the artists and craftsmen of the mediaeval period? Fault may be found also with the bibliography. It is somewhat fragmentary and not too well balanced. Perhaps a much merited future printing could include comments on the items listed. The author, however, is not to be singled out in a matter bearing rather upon the conventions of the historical guild, but there is something bordering on what, shall we say, in citing the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie,* Migne, the *Monumenta,* Denzinger's *Enchiridion,* and the *Cambridge Medieval History* (the *Modern* is not mentioned), when it is manifestly impossible to list other collections of sources, manuals, and compendia that have quite as much claim on inclusion. Similarly one wonders why Karrer's *Meister Eckhart* is noted and not his *Religions of Mankind* or Bernhart's *Philosophische Mystik des Mittelalters,* and so on, not to mention Wentzlaff-Eggebert, *Deutsche Mystik zwischen Mittelalter und Neuzeit.* Schnürer's *Kirche und Kultur im Mittelalter,* noted as undated, is dated.

Dr. Reinhardt, however, has done so well in so many other respects that we should not complain. Witness his characterizations of nationalism, of the careers and importance of the work of Nicholas of Cusa, Luther, Machiavelli, Richelieu and Mazarin, Louis XIV, Goethe, Bismarck, Comte, and the later day sociologists, the Kaiser and Spengler. Many of his analyses of the great names among the moulders of the conflicting intellectual and cultural currents of recent times are gratifyingly acute when considered in the light of obvious space limitations. Especially worth recommending are the author's observations on Rilke ("the swan song of German romantic idealism and man-centered humanism") and on Thomas Mann's "thin-blooded humanism." If the pages on literature, art, and science were assembled they would make up excellent compendia of German activity in those fields. We may not end without praise for the publisher on the excellence of his contribution to the production of a book well worth owning.

FRANCIS J. TSCHAN

State College, Pennsylvania

The Italian Madrigal. By Alfred Einstein. Translated by Alexander H. Krappe, Roger H. Sessions, and Oliver Strunk. Three Volumes. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. Vols. I and II. Pp. xvi, 476; 477-887; Vol. III, Musical Examples. Pp. 333, $30.00.)

Dr. Einstein studied musicology in Munich as well as composition, received a doctorate in musicology, and made extensive tours for the purpose of study in Italy in 1901, 1905, and 1908; he was exiled from Germany in 1933 and settled in Florence where he continued work on the present book. He is at present professor of music at Smith College. He has published many books on music, among which are *A History of Music* (1917), and a revision of the Koechel catalogue of Mozart's complete works, an undertaking which required great lexicological and musicological resource. Just as Einstein's biography of Mozart was an offshoot of his work on his revision of the *Koechelverzeichnis,* so his biography of Vogel, a German musicologist, was incidental to a deeper purpose to which Einstein asserts he has devoted forty years of research. In the preface he remarks, "In nearly forty years, not many weeks went by in which I did not score at least a few works from the old part-books."

The madrigal is a *secular* song scored for at least two voices, which reached its greatest development in the last half of the sixteenth century. Its name probably comes from the mediaeval Latin *matricale,* meaning a pastorale written in the mother tongue. Einstein has produced one of the few definitive works on music form, i.e., an almost complete historical treatment of an important and universal form. True, he limits himself to the Italian madrigal, but the essence of the madrigal style as it developed into a great style was Italian; its roots were buried in the musical techniques which the Italians copied and took over from the Burgundian and Netherland musicians. But the poetry which was written for the great achievements in madrigal composition in the sixteenth century was Italian. Perhaps the other most famous madrigal school was the English school which flourished later than the Italian and took its genesis from the Italian. Einstein carefully describes all the antecedent literary and musical forms, e.g., the rise in Mantua of a first nationalistic Italian school after two centuries of an Italian musical slump; the early school—Verdelot, Arcadelt, Festa, and Willaert, three of whom are still non-Italians writing in Italy; the post-classic madrigal, Rore (whom he slights as far as full treatment is concerned), and the three great *Oltremontani,* composers from other countries who thoroughly digested the Italian style—Lasso, Monte, and Wert; and the virtuoso madrigals of Marenzio, Gesualdo, and Monteverdi. In a fascinating unfolding Einstein traces the development of the madrigal from the love-song *frottolas,* the relation of the madrigal to the ecclesiastical music of the period 1470-1600, the blossoming out of the madrigal into an adequate polyphonic composition, and finally its disintegration in the works of Gesualdo, and its end and transformation into the *concertato* madrigal with the coming of the *continuo;* the turn to monody in its last stages. All through this development the author is careful not to oversimplify, but in and between the great names mentioned above he treats the contemporary schools, the lesser lights, and the composers of passing interest. He also treats related forms, the lighter forms of poetry and music which surrounded the madrigal. On page 167 of the first volume begins a treatment of the relation of words and music, an interesting problem throughout the history of vocal music and a problem whose history has not been written. There follows a somewhat positivistic treatment of the aesthetics of the sixteenth century (p. 213). One might say that the work is almost as valuable to the literary historian as to the musicologist. Einstein has ingeniously intertwined the development of many literary forms through this period, and has at every step of the way, carefully prepared the political, religious, and social background of the music and poetry.

Thus he has made into interesting reading what could very easily have been an extremely difficult work to digest. Pervading it also is an amiable glow of mellow humor, the humor of a scholar thoroughly at home with his material and chuckling over his notes. There are plenty of things to chuckle over; many of the madrigals were written to and performed by courtesans; there are love-songs celebrating with gay thoroughness each part of the beloved's body. The luxury and the frivolity of Renaissance courts are well known to historians; each court had its musicians who wrote for the courtiers, and there was no lack here of humanistic and hedonistic clerics, many of whom wrote madrigal verses.

Quite apart from Einstein's justifiable pooh-poohing of the loose-living in civil and ecclesiastical circles is his rather frequent habit of making sweeping over-simplifications in matters of faith and religious history. For example, he describes St. Francis of Assisi as belonging to a group of more progressive mediaeval thinkers who "were no longer satisfied with the mediaeval practice of blindly accepting matters of faith . . ." (I, 13). He seems always to think that if a musician has abandoned scurrilous and worldly writing and has turned more fully toward serious composition and specifically church music, in Palestina's case it was "in plain English . . . pure hypocrisy . . ." (I, 312) in Lasso's ". . . the same disease, religious scruples" (II, 477), or, "religious mania" (II, 496). One has the feeling each time that a religious or moral question arises, especially as is inevitable in this book directly concerned with Catholicism, that Einstein stands quietly by, pretending to be impartial, yet always painting the Church as an amusing mediaeval institution. Naturally, one realizes that it takes even a Catholic historian of great tact to treat the Florence of the Medici and of Savonarola with discreet appraisal.

At the end of the second volume is an excellent index of names covering both volumes. The whole third volume is a valuable collection of the full score of many madrigals hitherto unpublished and unavailable. There is no doubt that Einstein's work will be the reference and source book on the subject for a long time to come. It is touching to read at the end of the foreword to the third volume his claim that if he had included all the names of the people who helped him through the years and in so many countries to produce this work, "there would be a grotesque lack of proportion between the extent of these acknowledgments and the modest character of this first if undeniably somewhat voluminous attempt."

It must be said for the translators that the volumes read very smoothly and Princeton University Press should be congratulated for turning out so handsome a set of books. The binding, arrangement, and printing are excellent.

RUSSELL WOOLLEN

The Catholic University of America

History of Education. By Patrick J. McCormick. Revised by Frank P. Cassidy. (Washington: Catholic Education Press. 1946. Pp. xxv, 649. $4.00.)

Students and professors alike in the field of education will appreciate the revision of this basic text, first published in 1915. While there is evident increase in content throughout the four sections of the text but in varying degrees, a vital co-ordination is maintained by similarity of structure and style with the content of the original volume. Two notable characteristics of the revised edition are the concise synopses preceding each logical division of subject-matter, and more extensive bibliography. For the student they form a valuable aid to the more intensive study of a particular period of educational history. The synopsis preceding content divisions of material makes for greater co-ordination of ideas, and affords the student an over-all view of matter to be assimilated as a whole. It agreeably replaces the more detailed table of contents found in the original text. The desideratum of the earnest student of research is an adequate and specialized listing of relevant reference material for further research. This need is supplied in the reviser's compendium of basic materials by the augmented bibliography containing most recent studies which follows each chapter.

As regards amplification of content, Part One has been enlarged to embrace a more comprehensive treatment of certain phases of ancient culture. The attention given to the tenets of Japanese ideology enables the reader to gain a more correct perspective of these primitive peoples, and likewise, of their contemporaries.

It is the quality of additional content rather than the quantity that comprises the contribution to the interpretation of the patristic period. The reviser, gleaning the highlights of recent research on the works of the early fathers of the Church, has enriched the data of the pioneer edition with his latest findings.

The reader will derive further information and renewed interest from the more lengthy and lucid exposition of the Renaissance in Italy, although in Part Three, more than other sections, the reviser's remark holds more true: "Substantially, the content (of the original text) has been preserved."

The need for more current material on recent American educational trends has been supplied by the addition of two chapters to Part Four. Contemporary American educational leaders are treated succinctly with respect to the philosophical concepts underlying their psychological theories, and the influence which European components of these theories have exercised upon their American disciples. An account of the life of the Reverend Thomas E. Shields as an outstanding Catholic educator is included in this section. While modern state systems have been developed as far as the outbreak of World War II, the political and religious status of state systems will call for a future revision of this material, when it will be possible to arrive at a proper perspective of modern events.

In conclusion, one may rightly assume that the revised text has bridged the gap between the author's publication of 1915 and vital progress in research, theory, and practice since that period. If one is seeking a digest of major trends in the history of education through the years this text will serve the purpose.

TIMOTHY F. O'LEARY

Assistant Superintendent of Schools
Archdiocese of Boston

Revival of Paganism, by Gustave Combès. Translated by Augustine Stock, O.S.B. (Saint Louis: B. Herder Book Co. 1950. Pp. v, 360 $4.50.)

On more than one recent occasion it has been said that the greatest evil afflicting civilization today is secularism. Someone might dispute the statement with the contention that naturalism is a graver menace to the survival of Christian civilization. As a matter of fact, these two manifestations of the current revival of paganism are closely associated with each other. Using the word in its widest possible comprehension to include every type of indifference or hostility toward both natural and revealed religion, Gustave Combès' book is a study of its development. The nature and the purpose of the study are aptly described in its title.

The book is divided into three parts of which the first is an exposition of the development of this revival. About ten years ago William Montgomery McGovern published a book which traced the development of political ideas from Luther to Hitler. The first part of Combès' book involves a similar approach to a more specific theme. The work would be more effective if it had the readable qualities of McGovern's volume. Combès' thesis is not startlingly new in tracing the development of contemporary anti-religious philosophies from the cynical and naturalistic rationalism of the *quattrocento*. But it is a careful and detailed study of this development which reveals the author's wide acquaintance with the political, philosophical, and theological literature of these centuries. It is a veritable catalog of gleanings from the writings of men as well known as d'Holbach and Montesquieu and as little known as the Abbé de Saint Pierre. It might have been preferable had the author developed at greater length the implications of his gleanings. The reader feels lost in a maze of detail. Proudhon and Saint-Simon receive some, Marx more detailed treatment. Limitations of space undoubtedly determined the author's method of treatment. The development of paganism blossomed particularly in French secularism, German nationalism, and Russian bolshevism. The second part of Combès' book is a more penetrating analysis of these ideologies. He is, perhaps, most convincing and effective in his appraisal of French laicism. The occasional tendency to identify the excesses of National Socialism with the rank and file of the German people will probably offend the better Teutonic mind. This part of the author's work is based on a wide study of literature, particularly French, which for the most part was published at least two years before the outbreak of the recent war.

The third part is a study of the forces which today supplement the political action of the French, German, and Russian lay states. It is to be noted that these supplementary forces are international. Combès selects for analysis the four most consequential: Freemasonry, the League of the Rights of Man, the labor syndicate, and the Union of the Godless. These international groups operate with a philosophy which is increasingly hostile to any exhibition of reverence or regard for a deity. Rightly, he emphasizes the essential similarities between the socialist and communist groups in Europe. Especially interesting is his observation that the labor parties today are committed to the destruction of salaried groups. Their avowed purpose is the eventual laicization and de-Christianization of world civilization.

Combès' work is comprehensive, penetrating, and convincing. At times one detects slight inaccuracies. The reviewer knows of no reputable authority for the statement that Lenin was a Jew. Similarly, the statement that Lenin founded the Union of the Godless in 1925 is an error. He died early in 1924. But the work is a timely study of a virus that, with ever greater effect, is poisoning civilization around the world.

Henry W. Casper

The Creighton University

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Bishop John F. Dearden dedicated on October 8 the archives of the Catholic Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania which has recently been moved to the library of Duquesne University in Pittsburgh. Leo A. McMullen, president of the society, has asked that persons having material bearing on the Catholic history of western Pennsylvania contribute such to the society's collections. On November 1 the society sponsored the dedication of a statue of Our Lady at St. Mary of Mercy Church on Ferry Street in Pittsburgh. The dedication coincided appropriately with the definition of the dogma of the Assumption, the title which was given to the first chapel of the French at Fort Duquesne in 1754.

In the accounts of the trustee controversies in various parts of the United States during the first fifty years of the American hierarchy, the fact that several of the rebellious trustees were not good Catholics is quite apparent. That early American Catholics could be respected members of the congregation and not practicing Catholics at the same time seems to have eluded the observation of most historians. Bishop Simon Bruté of Vincennes, who was historically minded, did point out that Colonel Vigo was a trustee of the old Vincennes church but not a practical Catholic. The same could be said of certain other trustees or wardens of early American congregations. Generally these controversies over trusteeism took place while the blight of Jansenism still hung over Irish and French Catholicism and its descendants in this country, and the sacramental Catholicism expected of leading Catholics today did not then exist. There are indications of a wide divergence in some communities between Catholic profession and Catholic practice, excused in some measure by a lack of priests and churches, but also offering at the same time an explanation for the failure of a strong Catholic culture to develop among some immigrant Catholic groups.

Laurence J. Kelly, S. J., of Holy Trinity Church in Washington has published a twenty-eight page brochure, *A Carmelite Shrine in Maryland*, which gives an historical sketch of the foundation of the Discalced Carmelite nuns at Port Tobacco in Charles County, Maryland, in October, 1790. About half the brochure is devoted to the story of the efforts to restore properly the site of the old monastery, a movement which began formally in July, 1935, and still continues.

One of the amusing incidents in a recent volume of the memoirs of Abbé Félix Klein describes his interview with Alberto Lepidi, O.P., the Master of the Sacred Palace, who had given his *imprimatur* to the Abbé Charles Maignen's attack on the life of Father Isaac Hecker. When Lepidi attempted to defend his action in giving the *imprimatur* Klein forced him to admit that he had not read the biography of Hecker which was under attack in the book to which he gave the *imprimatur*. Abbé Klein's interview with Cardinal Rompolla, in which they discussed the Church's position in the Dreyfus affair, also makes interesting reading.

An unusual series of accidents has preserved an important group of papers dealing with the life of Father Basil Antoine Moreau, founder of the Congregation of Holy Cross. One incident in the life of Moreau which has been quite obscure concerned his relationships with the Sisters of the Good Shepherd at Angers, France, during the 1830's. Another priest who had dealings with the Sisters of the Good Shepherd at Angers at that time was Father Napoleon J. Perché, who in May, 1870, became Archbishop of New Orleans. Perché brought with him to the United States many documents and letters, among which were letters by and about Father Moreau. He kept these documents with him while he acted as a missionary in Kentucky and later took them with him to New Orleans, where he was chaplain of the Ursulines and publisher of *Le propagateur catholique*. These papers later went into the Archives of the Archdiocese of New Orleans and were presented to the Archives of the University of Notre Dame by the late Archbishop Francis Janssens. Recently members of the Congregation of Holy Cross working for the beatification of Father Moreau have found these documents very important for explaining that period in the life of their founder.

A document recently acquired by the Archives of the University of Notre Dame indicates that Father Edmund B. Kilroy, a priest of the Diocese of Fort Wayne, was approved by President Abraham Lincoln, on the suggestion of Governor Oliver P. Morton, as the first chaplain in the United States Navy. However, the appointment never became effective because Father Kilroy changed his mind after going to see Lincoln, accompanied by Representative Schuyler Colfax of South Bend. The letter of recommendation of Governor Morton, dated February 26, 1864, states that there were 20,000 Catholics then in the Union Navy but no Catholic chaplain.

Bulletin Number One, 1940-1950, of the Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Harvard University, is an elegantly printed and illustrated volume of about eighty pages devoted to the famous Bliss foundation in Georgetown and the first ten years of its accomplishments. It presents a description of the Dumbarton Oaks library and collection as well as of the mansion in which they are housed. Along with an indication of the purpose and organization of the research institute, dedicated to Byzantine and mediaeval humanities, it lists the publications, staff members, scholars, and programs of symposia and lectures. Among the illustrations there are several of the art treasures of the collection.

A new, attractively printed volume, entitled: *Thought Patterns,* published by St. John's University, Brooklyn, contains an article by Arpad F. Kovacs on "The Philosophy of History," and one by Francis L. Meade, C.M., on "St. Vincent de Paul, Organizer Unafraid." The publication, which will appear at irregular intervals, is intended to record "some of the lectures, addresses, articles, studies, and research projects of members of the faculty and of visitors who participate in the academic life of the University."

The American Council of Learned Societies has initiated a Faculty Study Fellowship program under which individual faculty members will be able to combine study and teaching at the same time. The purpose is to encourage scholars to enlarge the range of their knowledge by study in fields outside their special interest and training. Ordinarily they will continue their teaching in the school with which they are connected. The qualifications are a Ph.D. degree or its equivalent, a minimum of five years of teaching, and at least the rank of assistant professor. Candidates must not be over forty-five years of age and must be American citizens. This program was made possible by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation.

Donald Goodchild has resigned as secretary for fellowships and grants-in-aid of the American Council of Learned Societies after twenty years of efficient service in that position.

Between November 13, 1950, and February 8, 1951, the College of St. Thomas is sponsoring a series of six lectures by various experts on the general subject of the natural law. They are entitled the Archbishop Ireland Memorial Lectures.

The *Supplement* of the *American Political Science Review,* September, 1950, is entitled: "Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System," and is a report of the Committee on Political Parties of the American Political Science Association.

The July issue of the *Annals* of the American Academy of Political and Social Science deals with the Point Four program, and the September issue of the same journal is devoted to life behind the Iron Curtain.

The 1950 volume of *Rassegna storica del risorgimento* contains the papers of the twenty-eighth Congress di Storia del Risorgimento, held in Rome, October 12-14, 1949.

The April number of *Salesianum* [Turin] has several articles on Domenico Savio who was beatified on March 5 of last year.

The *Annals of the Organization of American States* began publication in 1949 with four numbers. It is one of two periodicals which replace the *Bulletin* of the Pan American Union. The *Annals* will publish quarterly in Spanish, English, Portuguese, and French all the official documents of the organization. It will take the place of the serial publications which the Pan American Union has issued separately in order to fulfill the function of disseminating and conserving the official results of the conferences, the texts of the treaties, the resolutions of the council, the conventions and resolutions of the specialized conferences and the reports on the activities of the Pan American Union. The other publication, entitled *Americas,* will be a monthly illustrated magazine dedicated to giving stimulus to the unofficial relations among the peoples of the Continent, to diffusing the most interesting aspects of their evolution and progress, to making more widely known the forms of their culture, and to presenting and discussing problems of a general character which affect them. The annual subscription price is $2.00 (Washington, D. C.: Pan American Union).

The International Colloquium on Luso-Brazilian Studies, one of the highlights of the Library of Congress' sesquicentennial celebration, was held in Washington from the 18th to the 21st of October and attracted some 200 scholars from the United States, Brazil, Portugal, France, England, Argentina, Spain, and Germany. The pioneer undertaking, the first of its kind, was highly successful, due especially to its sponsors, the Library of Congress and Vanderbilt University, and to its officers, Chairman Francis M. Rogers of Harvard University, Secretary Lewis Hanke of the Library of Congress, and Associate Secretary Manoel Cardozo of the Catholic University of America. Dr. Hanke's extraordinary capacity for organization and his contagious enthusiasm were largely responsible for the unusual international gathering. The proceedings of the Colloquium will be published by Vanderbilt University under the editorship of Professor Alexander Marchant.

In connection with the Colloquium, the Library of Congress announced the creation of a new chair of Luso-Brazilian studies, the first occupant of which is expected in Washington next summer. At the same time the Department of State made public the signing of a cultural agreement between the governments of the United States and Brazil which, when ratified, will make possible a greater intellectual exchange between the two countries.

Catholic University's official contribution to the program of the Colloquium was a reception in honor of the foreign representatives held in the Lima Library, at which time the Most Reverend Rector, the head of the Portuguese delegation, and the Brazilian Minister to The Hague spoke. An exhibition of rare Portuguese and Brazilian books from the collections of the Lima Library was also inaugurated.

The October, 1950, issue (Vol. VII, No. 2) of *The Americas*, organ of the Academy of American Franciscan History, was devoted to Brazil and dedicated to the International Colloquium on Luso-Brazilian Studies. There were articles or notes by Lewis Hanke, Manoel Cardozo, Jane Herrick, Ernesto Ennes, and Luiza Fonseca.

Catholic institutions of higher education in the United States represented at the colloquium included St. Louis University, Marquette University, De Paul University, University of Notre Dame, the College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Georgetown University, and the Catholic University of America.

The Third Annual Convocation of the Academy of American Franciscan History, of Washington, D. C., began on December 10 with a Pontifical High Mass at the Franciscan Monastery. The Apostolic Delegate to the United States was the celebrant and the Reverend Dr. John Francis Bannon, S.J., of St. Louis University, preached the sermon. On the evening of December 11 an academic session was held at McMahon Hall auditorium at the Catholic University of America with the Most Reverend Rector, Bishop Patrick J. McCormick, presiding and Professor Emeritus Aurelio M. Espinosa of Stanford University, serving as chairman. The speaker of the evening was Mr. Paul Murray, vice president and dean of Mexico City College, who delivered an address on Fray Antonio Margil. At this time the Serra Award of *The Americas* was presented to Miss Gabriela Mistral, the Chilean poet and Nobel prize winner. The officers of the Academy are Alexander Wyse, O.F.M., director and Roderick A. Wheeler, O.F.M., vice director and editor of *The Americas*.

Fray Toribio de Motolinia's history of the Indians of New Spain, translated and annotated by the Reverend Dr. Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M., formerly of the Catholic University of America and now of Quincy College, Illinois, will be published in January by the Academy of Franciscan History.

Vol. XI of the series on Latin-American Studies of the Institute of Latin-American Studies of the University of Texas has just appeared. It is a translation, with annotations and introduction, by Nettie Lee Benson of the *Report that Dr. Miguel Ramos de Arizpe Priest of Borbon, and Deputy in the Present General and Special Cortes of Spain for the Province of Coahuila One of the Four Eastern Interior Provinces of the Kingdom of Mexico Presents to the August Congress on the Natural, Political and Civil Condition of the Provinces of Coahuila, Nuevo León, Nuevo Santander, and Texas of the Four Eastern Interior Provinces of the Kingdom of Mexico* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1950. Pp. 61). The original report, the work of a liberal who spent six years in jail or otherwise in confinement for his political ideas, was printed in Cádiz in 1812.

Number 9 of the University of Miami's series on Hispanic-American Studies, edited by J. Riis Owre, is also off the press. It is devoted to Robert S. Chamberlain's study on *Francisco Morazán, Champion of Central American Federation* (Coral Gables: University of Miami Press, March 1950. Pp. 58).

The Greenlee Collection of Portuguese history and literature, numbering several thousand volumes, has been officially inaugurated at the Newberry Library in Chicago, which thus becomes one of the important centers in the country for the study of Luso-Brazilian history. The donor, Dr. William B. Greenlee, a recognized authority on the Age of Exploration, has been decorated by the Portuguese Government in appreciation for his efforts along cultural lines.

The first reunion of the Committee on Archives of the Commission on History of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History was recently held in Havana. The delegates from the United States were Philip Brooks, National Archives; Dan Lacy, Library of Congress; Herbert W. Krieger, National Museum; and Roscoe R. Hill, chief of the Department of State Archives in the National Archives, retired. Discussions at the meetings centered upon the establishment of an inter-American school of archivists, which presumably would be set up in Havana; the relations between American and European archives, in particular the archives of Spain; the exchange of services and documents; and the advisability of changing the name of the Committee from the Committee on Archives to the Commission on Archives.

Beginning with Vol. XIV, the *Handbook of Latin American Studies,* a project under the editorial control of the Library of Congress, will be published by the University of Florida Press.

Mrs. Ruth Lapham Butler of the Newberry Library is the author of the *Guide to the Hispanic American Historical Review 1918-1945* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1950). The list price is $6.00. Dr. Butler's work is an indispensable tool for those in the Ibero-American field.

The Most Reverend Eris O'Brien, Auxiliary Bishop of Sydney, paid a visit on November 6 to the Catholic University of America. Bishop O'Brien was in this country in his capacity as an adviser to the Australian delegation to the United Nations. He is the author of the two-volume work, *The Foundation of Catholicism in Australia: Life and Letters of Archpriest John Joseph Therry* (Sydney, 1922), as well as *The Dawn of Catholicism in Australia* (Sydney, 1927) in two volumes and *The Foundation of Australia* (London, 1936). He was likewise a contributor to the volume, *Australia,* edited by C. Hartley Grattan (Berkeley, 1947).

Bishop O'Brien took the doctorate in church history at the University of Louvain in 1935, and at the time of his consecration in 1948 he was a lecturer in modern history in the University of Sydney. He has been working for some time on the life of Patrick Cardinal Moran, third Archbishop of Sydney (1830-1911), who was himself a church historian and who spent many years of his priestly life doing research work in the Vatican Archives, mainly in the field of Irish history. Cardinal Moran published before his death a two-volume work entitled the *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia* (Sydney. 1895), which carried the story down to his own arrival there in 1885.

Carlos E. Castañeda, professor of Latin-American history in the University of Texas and president in 1939 of the American Catholic Historical Association, was invested as a knight commander in the Order of Isabella the Catholic on October 19.

Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., instructor in Semitic languages in the Catholic University of America, is spending the current year in Jerusalem on a fellowship won at the American School of Oriental Research.

William L. Davis, S.J., has been on leave from Gonzaga University, Spokane, to do research in European archives.

Daniel D. McGarry, formerly at Indiana University, has been named an associate professor in the newly created Institute of Mediaeval History at St. Louis University.

John H. Kennedy, who for the past several years has been teaching at Yale University, has joined the directorate of intelligence at the headquarters of the United States Air Force in Washington.

Dr. Alceu Amoroso Lima, also known as Tristão de Ataíde, his penname, will succeed Dr. Jorge Basadre as Director of the Department of Cultural Affairs of the Pan American Union, effective January 1, 1951. The new Director, a distinguished literary figure, has for many years been one of the active leaders of the Catholic Action movement in Brazil. We are pleased to welcome Dr. Amoroso Lima to our midst and look forward to a profitable association with him.

Professor Charles R. Boxer of the University of London has been awarded a fellowship by Princeton University to permit him to work in the rich archives of Goa, Portuguese India.

Professor James F. King of the University of California, Berkeley, is now in Spain in connection with a research project.

Mathias Kiemen, O.F.M., of the Academy of American Franciscan History and a graduate student in history at the Catholic University of America, has arrived in Lisbon to work in the Portuguese archives.

The July number of *Primitive Man* is devoted to articles on the late Monsignor John Montgomery Cooper.

The April, 1950, issue of the *Journal of European Affairs* is devoted to articles on Thomas G. Masaryk.

In the death of the Reverend Joseph Ludwig in Toledo on October 10 American Catholic history was deprived of the services of an enthusiastic and careful student. Father Ludwig at the request of Bishop Karl J. Alter had been working for over a year on a history of the Diocese of Toledo and had acquired considerable published and unpublished materials for his history. Father Ludwig, chaplain of Notre Dame Academy since 1933, was a diocesan consultor. A native of Germany, he was born in Waldern on September 11, 1887. Bishop Joseph Schrembs ordained him for the Diocese of Toledo in 1913.

Michael Williams, prominent Catholic journalist and author, died on October 12 at the age of seventy-three. Mr. Williams was president of the American Catholic Historical Association in 1934 and chose for his presidential address at Washington that year, "The Contemporary Crisis in Thought and the Historian." He was the author of a number of volumes, but the historian will remember him best for *American Catholics in the War* (New York, 1921), *Catholicism and the Modern Mind* (New York, 1928), and *The Shadow of the Pope* (New York, 1932).

The Dominican Sisters of San Rafael are celebrating the centenary of their foundation in California.

The Religious of the Sacred Heart are observing the 150th anniversary of their founding by Saint Madeleine Sophie Barat.

Documents:

In Defense of the Maranhão Indians of Colonial Brazil. A Report of Frei Christovão de Lisboa, O.F.M. to the Conselho Ultramarino, Lisbon, October 29, 1647. Luiza Fonseca (ed.) (*Americas,* Oct.).—Tratado muy docto hecho por el Señor Arçobispo D. Fr. Miguel de Benavides, açerca de los tributos que pagan los indios y la obligación que tienen de pagarlos fielmente, ed. Jesús Gaye, O.P. (*Unitas,* Apr.).— Opúsculo que escrivió el Señor Arçobispo Don Fr. Miguel de Benavides a los Religiosos de S. Augustín de Ilocos açerca de los indios, quáles son reservados y quáles han de pagar, muy provechoso para confessores que tienen muchas dudas, que es neçessario sepan para no errar. *(ibid.).*—Statutes of the Guatemalan Indigo Growers' Society, 1782. Robert S. Smith (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.,* Aug.).—Lettres inédites de Mgr d'Astros, archevêque de Toulouse. R. Limouzin-Lamothe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* July).—Lettere inedite di Giuseppe Mazzini a Giuseppe Dolfi. Elio Conti (*Rassegna storica del risorgimento,* July, 1949).—Treize lettres inédites de Cavour. Paul Guichonnet *(ibid.).*

BRIEF NOTICES

Rust, Paul R., O.M.I. *The First of the Puritans and the Book of Common Prayer.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1949. Pp. xiii, 270. $3.75.)

Ritualistic Anglicans who have laid the flattering unction to their souls that the *Book of Common Prayer* is a legitimate descendent, couched in admirable English, of the old Sarum Rite, will question the thesis of Father Rust that it is little more than a revision of the thoroughly Protestant *Second Ordinal* of 1552. Henry VIII stopped at the outer frontier of schism, burning at the stake those who denied Transubstantiation at the same time that he hung those who refused to acknowledge him as legitimate head of the English Church, without dependence on the Pope of Rome. On Henry's death, Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and Somerset, the Lord Protector of England, having liberty to indulge their Protestant tendencies with the new king, a sickly boy, Edward VI, proceeded to reform the liturgy in accordance with the "New Thought," timidly in the First Prayer Book of 1549 but openly in the revision of 1552. As English supplanted Latin, the Mass became a communion service and the sacrificing priesthood the Anglican ministry. Father Rust, in a series of proofs drawn from the books themselves, shows that the authors of the *Book of Common Prayer* were the forerunners of the Puritans of the seventeenth century, whose determination was to reduce the Church of England to the level of Zwinglian worship. The result of their labors was not a liturgy, in the best traditions of Sarum, but a dismembered and mutilated form of worship, whose chief appeal is the magnificent language in which it is clothed. Cranmer and Latimer and Hooper were not the ancestors of the High Church of the seventeenth century and the tractarians of the nineteenth but rather of the Puritans who landed on Plymouth Rock in 1620.

(William J. Lallou)

Sargent, Daniel. *Their Hearts Be Praised: The Life of St. John Eudes.* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. 1949. Pp. xiii, 309. $3.50.)

Although much has been written in French on the life, works, and significance to the modern world of St. John Eudes (canonized 1925), there has been a dearth of information in English. To remedy this situation the Eudist Fathers asked Mr. Sargent to do a life of the saint in English and provided him with what he calls "a library of books" on the subject.

Relying principally upon P. D. Bonlay's four volume *Vie du venerable Jean Eudes,* Mr. Sargent has wrought out an incident-packed story of Eudes' labors as a missionary to the seventeenth-century French populace torn between Calvinism on the one hand and Jansenism on the other; his persistent and ultimately successful attempts to establish the Order of Our Lady of Charity; his repeatedly thwarted efforts to organize a congregation of priests to conduct seminaries for the education of candidates for the priesthood; and his devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and the Admirable Heart of Mary which caused

Pope Leo XIII to call him the author of the liturgical worship of these adorable and admirable Hearts are all described.

The seventeenth century was full of confusing cross-currents, and this in addition to the saint's many interests, may account for the fact that Mr. Sargent's biography of St. John Eudes lacks a certain coherence and lucidity. The ordinary reader will find it somewhat difficult to follow the thread of the story which frequently threatens to become entangled in its chronology. Some of the sweeping condemnations of the saint's opponents seem to be a bit uncharitable. It is not necessary to raise St. John to the stature of sainthood by attributing the basest motives to all those who disagreed with him.

The translations from the French are not always couched in idiomatic English, and the proof-reading could have been more carefully done. "Quit" appears as "quite" (p. 66) ; "Congreation" stands for "Congregation" (p. 240) ; and "plenary" is spelled "pleniary" (p. 297). This is not the best of Mr. Sargent's biographies. (PATRICK N. BUTLER)

SCHMAUS, MICHAEL. *Katholische Dogmatik*. 2 Volumes. (Munich: Max Hueber, 1948-1949. Pp. xvi, 648; xvi, 962. gebd. DM 29.80; brosch. DM 26.80.)

Father Michael Schmaus, the author of this work, has been for some years a professor at the University of Munich. As early as 1937 his volumes covering the field of special dogma began to appear. They are written in German, and in a few years the demand for them was heavy enough to warrant four editions, of which this is the last and somewhat revised printing. This in itself speaks well for the work, especially since such other excellent manuals in the mother tongue as those of Scheeben, Heinrich, Pohle, Bartmann, Diekamp, and others, were already available.

The aim of the author was not to present a study in scientific theology, nor even to write a textbook suitable to the needs of men preparing for the priesthood. However, this does not mean that this treatment is unscientific or that seminarians could derive no benefit from the work, but rather that he assumes the reader is sufficiently familiar with much that the ordinary textbook of dogma designates as proofs from Scripture and tradition. He, therefore, hurries along, as it were, to give to those who wish to meditate and preach on the teachings of the Church a sort of practical lecture on the various tracts of dogmatic theology.

In these volumes he covers the usual problems found in the textbooks under the titles: De Deo creatore, De Deo creante et elevante, De peccato originali, De Christo Redemptore, De Marialogia, etc. Throughout the work Father Schmaus is quite abreast of the times. This is particularly true of such problems as the interpretation of Genesis, the Church and evolution, the origin of the human race, etc. The bibliography is both up to date and abundant. Since the author wrote primarily for his countrymen, one finds, as should be expected, that German books predominate and that some notable books written in other languages are not mentioned. (LOUIS A. ARAND)

SILVER, JAMES W. *Edmund Pendleton Gaines, Frontier General.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1949. Pp. xxi, 291. $4.50.)

This volume is a worthy contribution to the Southern Biography Series, published by the Louisiana State University Press. General Gaines is known to the average student of history chiefly for his blistering controversies with Scott, Jackson, Governor Troup of Georgia, and his superiors in the War Department. Dr. Silver gives us a deeper perspective of the man by fitting him into the significant social and political realities of his time. Doubtless ill fortune and circumstances prevented him from achieving the degree of fame to which his ability entitled him. Although he defeated the British regulars in 1814 at Fort Erie, a wound deprived him of further glory on the Canadian border and delayed his junction with Jackson's command until after the Battle of New Orleans. His own headlong aggressiveness just prior to the Mexican War caused him to lose his command, and a share in the glory of Scott or Taylor.

The key to Gaines' endless and magnificent controversies, as the author explains, lay in the difficulties of communication and the consequent necessity for individual responsibility on the frontier, quite as much as in the fiery tempers of the personalities involved. The inherent nature of the general's assignments, moreover, would certainly have embroiled a less excitable man. He fought the British, the Spaniards, and the Indians; presided over the court martial of Arbuthnot and Ambruster; and guarded the border of West Florida and of Mexico. Although he fought the Creeks, Seminoles, and Cherokees, he was one of the great early friends of the Indians. His attitude was most unusual for that period if not unique among Indian fighters. General Gaines made many original and novel proposals to Congress and to the War Department. His idea of immense floating batteries for harbor defense was rejected in favor of more mobile warships. An elaborate plan for government financed railroads, designed especially for strategic purposes, was also shelved.

The study, enlivened somewhat by Gaines' quarrels with his superiors, is not exciting reading. Useful and stimulating to the student, it will hardly be found appealing to the casual reader. Contemporary portraits provide interesting illustrations and the maps are of good quality. The documentation and index are excellent. (J. WALTER COLEMAN)

STEDMAN, MURRAY S., JR. and SUSAN W. *Discontent at the Polls: A Study of Farmer and Labor Parties 1827-1948.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. x, 190. $2.75.)

In spite of the fact that they confine themselves exclusively to secondary source materials, Dr. Murray S. Stedman, Jr. and his wife Susan Winter Stedman, have made a modest but creditable contribution to the field of American political history. The authors show rare wisdom by clearly limiting their objectives. Their thesis, succinctly stated in the preface, is that, "farmer and labor parties in the United States have performed two great functions . . . first, to act as vehicles for the expression of political discontent, and secondly, to popularize issues which the major parties have at first ignored but later have adopted." In proving this thesis many classic examples both in state and national elections are cited. In 1896 the Democrats by nominating a silver man, William Jennings Bryan, "in effect stole the thunder of the Populists." On their side the Populists favored fusion with the Democrats, "seeing in such fusion a fighting chance of sweeping the country for silver and inflation." Bryan's defeat spelled political death for the Populist party. Again in 1932 the Democratic party definitely checked the development of the Socialist, Communist, Socialist Labor, Liberty, Farmer-Labor and Jobless parties by surrendering to their demands. But for lack of space, other cases in point could be mentioned.

The charts, tables and appendices are helpful in that they bring out in graphic form the ideas embodied in the text. The index is good, being both sufficiently detailed and analytical. The lack of a bibliography is a defect. A good one would have been of genuine service to scholars. (HERBERT J. CLANCY)

STEPHANOU, PELOPIDAS ÉTIENNE, S.J. *Jean Italos philosophe et humaniste.* [*Orientalia christiana analecta,* 134.] (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum. 1949. Pp. 124.)

John Italus, a pupil of Psellus and his successor as head of the School of Philosophy at the University of Constantinople, is an interesting figure in the intellectual life of Byzantium. His career ended when he was condemned for heresy by the Emperor Alexius Comnenus I. Stephanou's thesis is that he fell a victim to the opposition of the monks to all secular learning. Italus, following in the footsteps of Psellus, attempted to interpret dogma in the light of philosophy. But this innovation clashed with a conception deeply anchored in the monastic tradition which held that only mystical experience can give knowledge in the transcendental and mysterious sphere of revelation, that the only proper method is intuition, contemplation, not discursive reasoning. The conflict resulting made the issue political and the emperor decided in favor of the monks whose support he sorely needed. Yet Italus was not a formal heretic. Some of the theories condemned were unquestionably orthodox and though his ardor for the classics and his efforts to elucidate the faith by neo-platonic concepts led to dangerous and even doubtful conclusions, he was himself shocked when this was pointed out and unreservedly offered to submit. But it was not this or that particular speculation that was condemned; it was all speculation.

(MARTIN J. HIGGINS)

STRAUS, HANNAH ALICE. *The Attitude of the Congress of Vienna toward Nationalism in Germany, Italy, and Poland.* [Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, No. 558.] (New York: Columbia University Press. 1949. Pp. 164. $2.75.)

Less successfully than Utrecht in the previous century, the Congress of Vienna attempted to set the international political pattern of Europe. While the congress did not ignore nationalism, as this solid and well-documented study shows, there were no soothsayers among the glittering assemblage to predict the shattering impact of nationalism on the course of later decades of the century.

Dissenting from the views of Treitschke, Bibl, and others who condemn the diplomats, and from the judgments of Lamprecht, Ward, and those who blame the anti-nationalist character of the epoch, the author has endeavored to investigate the intelligence of the congress in facing the spirit of nationalism with specific reference to the situation of Germany, Italy, and Poland. The word "nationalism" as here used refers to the demand by its adherents for a national state, at a time when few European nationalities were completely aware of any cultural unity.

In Germany, for instance, Prussia, the mediatized princes, Hanover, the small states, and free cities were not supporting the same thing when they made use of the term. Nationalism without a popular foundation was a cloak for political ambition, and a category which included the interests and desires, power and security of unrepresentative classes. From the viewpoints of France, England, and Austria the balance of power was a more important political instrument. Their representatives neither misunderstood nor disregarded nationalist principles, but took a dim view of the revolutionary concept as a basis for equilibrium in Europe, or as a foundation for their own national self-interest.

The first part of the volume discusses some supporters and opponents of German nationalism while the second part treats of the congress in relation to Polish and Italian nationalism. A peculiar difficulty of the organization chosen is, perhaps, an inevitable amount of repetition and an occasional awkward transition. Scholarly, written in a clear, straightforward style, the volume has a freshness of viewpoint and emphasis. A satisfactory bibliography and a limited index are appended. (WILLIAM J. GRATTAN)

SWIFT, STEPHEN K. *The Cardinal's Story. The Life and Work of Joseph, Cardinal Mindszenty, Primate of Hungary.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1949. Pp. xviii, 328. $3.75.)

This lucidly written book should serve to awaken in the minds of its readers a full awareness that the forces of evil present in Europe today have regard for neither natural law nor natural rights. Presented herein is a brief summation of the life and works of the now incarcerated Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty. One is fascinated by the greatness and the humility of the primate so touchingly described by Mr. Swift. Perhaps, however, the most amazing feature of this work is the presentation not only of the careful, shrewd, and diabolical schemes devised by the cardinal's opposition to rid themselves of this obstacle to full realization of their plans, but also the extreme physical and psychological suffering, imposed upon a resolute will.

Moreover, the inclusion of a transcript of this acted farce in the name of justice, and the lines and manner of questioning of the cardinal and his fellow prisoners when carefully analyzed and considered, are severe indictments of the regime that imposed them. Mr. Swift has apparently concentrated his efforts upon the events following December 26, 1948. The story of this persecuted man of God becomes under the author's careful handling a moving portrayal.

Perhaps, in describing Mindszenty's life and service prior to his arrest, not enough emphasis has been placed upon the cardinal's assistance to the Jews during the years of German occupation and his opposition to the Arrow and the Cross with his consequent imprisonment under the Nazi regime. The cardinal's very logical reason for opposing the land reform measure of his communist adversaries is not fully developed.

However, despite these criticisms Mr. Swift has provided a memorable book which should be placed on the shelves of every library as a reminder not only of the man Mindszenty but also that the rights we enjoy as Americans are deserving of protection and eternal vigilance. (Frank H. Kelly)

Trollope, Frances. *Domestic Manners of the Americans.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1949. Pp. lxxxiii, 454, xix. $5.00.)

"She deserved gratitude . . . but it is an error to suppose she got it," was Mark Twain's summation of *Domestic Manners* and the 1830 American reaction. Aided by Donald Smalley's illuminating preface and footnotes, Americans of 1950 may revel in Frances Trollope's "gossiping pages." "America in the age of Jackson" is a blurb on the book's jacket, but it is no political commentary. To Mrs. Trollope the pronounced difference between her home land and America was in the latter "the want of refinement." Of all the lack of fastidiousness at which she retched, most often scored was tobacco chewing and its necessary consequence.

That was of the men; what of the fair sex? Over and over again she made this observation: "I never saw, or read, of any country where religion had so strong a hold upon the women, or a slighter hold upon the men." Further than that, "were it not for the church, indeed, I think there might be a bonfire of the best bonnets, for I could never discover any other use for them." Though occasionally tinctured with what Sister Augustina Ray termed the English tradition of "fierce hatred of Spain and the Inquisition," Mrs. Trollope's caustic eye generally admired the Catholic Church. The chapel of St. Mary's Seminary she decided was "the prettiest" of all churches and chapels in Baltimore. Of Archbishop James Whitfield she erred in saying, "the prelate is a cardinal," an anachronism which the editor failed to note. Bishop Edward Fenwick, O.P., of Cincinnati was one of the few Americans who drew her unqualified praise when she said, "I have never known in any country a priest of a character and bearing more truly apostolic."

While *Domestic Manners* might be classed as "light reading," there is a solid foundation of literary worth available for the taker. Skimmed through or culled over, it rewards the reader with the lively observations of an English gentlewoman who made no attempt to please her American cousins.

(Peter J. Rahill)

VILLENEUVE, MARCEL DE LA BIGNE DE. *Un grand philosophe et sociologue méconnu: Blanc de Saint-Bonnet.* (Paris: Beauchesne. 1949. Pp. 150.)

In writing this short biography of Antoine Blanc de Saint-Bonnet the author attempted to rescue from oblivion another of those French scholars who because of the soundly theological turn of their writings were given at best in the nineteenth century the silent treatment. Typical of the reception accorded in certain quarters to Catholic scholarship during the years of the Third Republic prior to World War I is the article on Blanc de Saint-Bonnet in the *Grand dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle.* Here he is described as one of the most backward thinkers of his time. De Villeneuve's brochure contains as well an analysis of Blanc de Saint-Bonnet's more important works, which among others included, *L'unité spirituelle, La doleur,* and *Restauration française.*

Blanc de Saint-Bonnet was interested in the philosophy of economics, government, and history more than he was in these fields as sciences. For him philosophy was a study of God in relation to all the human sciences. He regarded it as the *ancilla theologiae.* Like de Maistre and Donoso Cortes he belonged to that school of thought which did not regard the French Revolution as an unmixed blessing. Historians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have too easily allowed their minds concerning the Revolution to be completely conditioned by their judgments of the old regime. The conservatism of Blanc de Saint-Bonnet explains, according to the author, why his writings were never given the recognition which they deserved even in the liberal atmosphere of the last century. Rightfully he takes exception to confusing the conservatism of Blanc de Saint-Bonnet with reaction. Time has seen the fulfillment of more than one of his predictions. (HENRY W. CASPER)

WALKER, JAMES BLAINE. *The Epic of American Industry.* (New York: Harper & Bros. 1949. Pp. xii, 513. $5.00.)

Starting with the assertions: "Our people enjoy both political freedom and an abundance of this world's goods. The two are vitally interrelated," and "We Americans are pre-eminently a business people," Mr. Walker has essayed to tell the story of the growth of America's wealth under freedom. He is not unmindful of the great blessings of abundance of natural resources and of stimulating climate; nor does he ignore the contribution from the hard work of the people. But he finds the essential reasons for our outstanding achievements in the genius of our businessmen and in the political climate that afforded economic as well as political and religious freedom. His great concern is that alien, hostile philosophies will deceive us into curtailing that freedom and thereby destroying the incentive and opportunity for us and our children to continue building as our fathers did.

This is not a formal history; it is not an economic history of the United States. It is a history of American business, related episodically by recounting the rise of some of our outstanding industries. It is not an objective approach; very little is said of flagrantly unethical methods employed by so many in those campaigns for control of the industries. So much praise for the results with so little comment on the evil practices that one may wonder if achievements so effected are properly laudable.

The tale is told in a very interesting way; the style is light, indulging even in slang. The illustrations are good, enhancing a well-made book, which within its limitations does tell the story well. There are a few specific criticisms. The account of the contest between Jackson and the bank is too anti-Jackson. There is no need of being so cautious as to write that the I.C.C. came into being because of the *belief* that the railroads were discriminating (p. 390); it is a known fact, and the author had maybe unwittingly asserted it previously.

Mr. Walker recognizes the necessity of governmental interest in the situation resulting from the great concentration of industry in the present century, and for some legislation and some agencies he has words of praise; he is not nearly so critical of the New Deal as one might have expected. He asserts the necessity of such restraints as the Sherman Act, and the importance of such measures in preventing the formation of the powerful combinations which in Europe ossified business, retarded production, and have given a strong incentive to socialism (p. 235). (P. RAYMOND NIELSON)

WECKMANN, LUIS. *Las bulas alejandrinas de 1493 y la teoría política del papado medieval.* With an introduction by Ernst H. Kantorowicz.. [Publicaciones del Instituto de Historia, Primera Serie, Numero 11.] (Mexico, O. F.: Impreso en los Talleres de la Editorial Jus. 1949. Pp. 311. $15.00 Mexican.)

This volume by Luis Weckmann is difficult to review for it treats such a wide range of topics and deals with each so well that a reviewer is tempted to dwell at length on each. Basically, however, this is an excellent study of the legal basis of the jurisdiction claimed by the mediaeval pontiffs over all islands of Europe, described in a phrase of the author as the "Omni-Insular Doctrine."

Really, therefore, this work should be of primary interest to the mediaevalist, particularly to the student of mediaeval political thought for this aspect seems to be its most important contribution. Insofar, the title of the volume seems to be misleading, since it places so much emphasis on the Alexandrine bulls, although these form merely an epilogue to the main stream of research. In reality the work contains a stimulating study of the donation of Constantine, its effects on the development of mediaeval political theory, the legal basis for the Peter's Pence and, in particular, on the development of the omni-insular doctrine.

From a careful study of the style of all the diplomata referring to "papal island suzerainty" available to the author, he concludes that, during the Middle Ages, specifically since the *Cum universae insulae* of Urban II in 1091, the Roman pontiffs not only claimed jurisdiction over all the islands of Europe but that this claim was recognized by the lay rulers as valid. Hence, after the first voyage of Columbus, Alexander VI was merely observing the precedent of centuries when he entrusted the newly discovered "islands" to the Spanish monarchs and marked the limits of their jurisdiction by his famous line of demarcation. His act was not, therefore, the result of a rash assumption of authority, as was frequently stated up to this time, but it was one fully warranted by the custom of mediaeval law. Thus it would seem, as Professor Kantorowitz states in his gracious introduction, "For the historian of the Americas, too, it pays to be a mediaevalist." (ANTONINE S. TIBESAR)

WEST, ROBERT FREDERICK. *Alexander Campbell and Natural Religion.* (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1948. Pp. ix, 250. $3.75.)

Alexander Campbell is best known for his part in the founding of the Disciples of Christ and for his debate with Archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati. In this closely-written study Robert West considers him as one of the most prominent of the opponents of deism and of any form of naturalism which attacked revealed religion. He was the most noted figure in the primitive gospel movement which contributed greatly to stirring up an interest in revealed religion on the American frontier. The character of this book is such as to place it among works on religion or philosophy rather than history. As far as it goes and within the limits set by the author, it is a competent study of Campbell's achievement, or rather of his ideas, because the extent of his influence is not brought out. Nor is the author apparently too clear on this point in his own mind, for he tells us at the end of the book that it is doubtful just where among the apologists and defenders of the "universal Christian faith" Campbell's place is to be. One wonders how well equipped for such a task Campbell could be, who had no formal training in any kind of theology. That he had zeal and conviction there is no doubt, but how far knowledge kept pace with zeal is a question. His concern for pure bible Christianity made him impatient of the claims of infallibility by traditional believers, so that it seems to this reviewer that a discussion of his views on this point leads into the field of religious polemic rather than that of history. Certainly the reaction of a Catholic to his attacks on the Church will not be favorable, to say the least. But as a study of the religious current of the day outside of the Catholic Church this work will have interest and value. (WILLIAM J. O'SHEA)

WILDE, ROBERT. *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1949. Pp. xviii, 239. $2.75.)

Father Wilde's monograph presents a complete and critical investigation of the statements (at times *obiter dicta*) made about the Jews in our surviving Christian texts of the first three centuries. Two chapters, one giving the necessary historical background, the other discussing pertinent notices in profane writers of the same time limits, serve the purpose of a lengthy introduction. The remaining seven chapters list the extant comments both favorable and unfavorable. The copious documentation substantiates the author's conclusions that unfavorable pagan comment on the Jews is based predominantly on Jewish social and religious exclusivism, and that Christian writers are moved to unfavorable statements by considerations almost exclusively theological. In the reviewer's opinion it is regrettable that the author did not state more clearly his reasons for treating in separate chapters such important men as Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and his successors. In the case of the latter a pertinent note as to the precise meaning of *successors* would have enhanced the value of this worthwhile study. (HERMIGILD DRESSLER)

PERIODICAL LITERATURE

MISCELLANEOUS

The Necessity of Scholarship. Arthur Darby Nock (*Official Register of Harvard University, Harvard Divinity School,* Apr.).

Geschichtsdeutung als theologisches Problem. Bitterfeld von Martin Burgwitz (*Theologische Literaturzeitung,* June).

Historicism. C. S. Lewis (*Month,* Oct.).

Dogmatic Intolerance and Civil Toleration. Max Pribilla (*ibid.*).

Origin and History in Brief of the Academic Costume. Sister M. Lilliana Owens, S. L. (*Catholic Educ. Rev.,* Mar.).

The Role of History in the Catholic Liberal Arts College. Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C. (*ibid.,* Oct.).

The Welfare State. Friedrich Baerwald (*Thought,* Sept.).

Gandhi in Retrospect. Jerome D'Souza (*ibid.*).

The Problem of Symbolism. Jean Danielou (*ibid.*).

Culture and Belief. William F. Lynch (*ibid.*).

Democracy, Leisure, and Communism. Thomas I. Cook (*Jrn. of Politics,* Aug.).

Law in Aristotle and St. Thomas. Walter Farrell, O.P. (*New Scholasticism,* Oct.).

O problema do direito natural no pensamento contemporâneo. L. Cabral de Moncada (*Boletim da Faculdade de Direito da Universidade de Coimbra,* Vol. XXV, Fasc. II, 1949).

Natural Right and the Historical Approach. Leo Strauss (*Rev. of Politics,* Oct.).

Communism, Islam and Nationalism in China. John M. H. Lindbeck (*ibid.*).

El positivismo en la filosofía del derecho contemporánea. González Vicen (*Revista de estudios políticos,* May and July).

Influência da geografia física sôbre a evolução histórica da Europa (as invasões bárbaras vistas pelo geógrafo. Roger Dion (*Revista de história,* Apr.).

Une coutume égyptienne? (Proverbes, XVII, 10). R. P. B. Couroyer (*Revue biblique,* July).

Trois autres fragments du Livre de Porphyre "Contre les chrétiens." P. Nautin (*ibid.*).

Jewish Legends about Simon-Peter. Julius H. Greenstone (*Historia Judaica,* Oct.).

A Note on the New Edition of Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities. Guido Kisch (*ibid.*).

Law and Justice for the Jew: The Jews in Medieval Germany. Gray C. Boyce (*ibid.*).

Structure and History of the *Tefilah.* M. Liber (*Jewish Quart. Rev.,* Apr.).

New Sources for the History of the Jewish Diaspora in Asia in the 16th Century. Walter J. Fischel (*ibid.*).

The Origin of the Alphabet. H. Tur-Sinai [Forczyner] *ibid.,* (July and Oct.).

Noms et chiffres pontificaux. R. Thibaut, S.I. (*Nouvelle revue théologique,* Sept.).

Bulletin d'histoire des doctrines chrétiennes.—A) Antiquité; B) Moyen âge occidental; C) Temps modernes. P. Th. Camelot, J. A. Robilliard, Y. Congar, H.-F. Dondaine, A. Duval (*Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques,* Apr.).

The Problem of Theophilus. Robert M. Grant (*Harvard Theolog. Rev.,* July).

Le monde byzantin. Paul Lemerle (*Revue historique,* July).

Johannes Damaskenos, Rom und Byzanz (1054-1500). G. Hoffman, S.I. (*Orientalia christiana periodica,* Vol. XVI, N. I-II).

Palimpsestbruchstücke der syrischen Version der Jakobusanaphora auss dem 8. Jahrhundert in der Handschrift add 14615 des British Museum. O. Heiming, O.S.B. (*ibid.*).

Ireland and France at Luxeuil. Aubrey Gwynn (*Studies,* Sept.).

Jonas of Bobbio. Helena Concannon (*ibid.*).

Note sull' Aristotele latino medioevale. L. Minio-Paluello (*Revista di filosofia neoscolastica,* May).

William of Saint-Thierry and the Author of the *Summa Sententiarum.* Damian Van den Eynde, O.F.M. (*Franciscan Studies,* Sept.).

The Sons of St. Francis in the Holy Land. Martiniano Roncaglia, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

De elementis traditionalibus justitiae in primaeva schola Franciscana. Hermenegildus Lio, O.F.M. (*ibid.*).

Erasmus and Christian Unity. Joseph Lecler (*Month,* Sept.).

Erasmus and the Religious Tradition. Eugene F. Rice, Jr. (*Jrn. of the Hist. of Ideas,* Oct.).

Opera Omnia of St. Lawrence of Brindisi, Ronald Jansch (*Round Table of Franciscan Research,* Oct.).

St. Lawrence's Dispute with Polycarp Laiser. Giles Soyka (*ibid.*).

Lawrence the Saint. Capistran Ferrito (*ibid.*).

Dominique de Saint-Albert, sa vie et sa correspondance avec Jean de Saint-Samson. Suzanne-Marie Bouchereaux (*Analecta ordinis Carmelitarum,* Vol. XV, Fasc. I).

Il Padre Gregorio Girard, O.F.M. Conv. (1765-1850), Educator e pedagogista. Leone P. Veuthey, O.F.M. Conv. (*Miscellanea Francescana,* Apr.).

Intorno alla cronologia di S. Tommaso d'Aquino (c. 1220-1274). Giuseppe P. Abate, O.F.M. Conv. (*ibid.*).

Opere giovanili di S. Bernardino da Siena. Giovanni Pollicini (*ibid.*).

Jesuitentheologie in schwedischen Biblioteken. Friedrich Stegmüller (*Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu,* Jul., 1949).

El P. Diego de Avendãno, S.I. (1594-1688) y la tesis teocrática "Papa, Dominus Orbis." Antonio de Egaña, S.I. (*ibid.*).

Azione pacificatrice e caritatevole del papato contemporaneo. A. Oddone, S.I. (*La civiltà cattolica,* Oct.).

Das Christen-Verbot in Japan unter dem Tokugawa-Regime. Hubert Cieslik, S.J. (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft—Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire,* July).

Spuren christlicher Glaubeswahrheiten im Koran: IX. Auferstehung und Weltgericht. Joseph Henninger, S.V.D. (*ibid.*).

Kulturarbeit eines Missionars in China. Aug. Tellkamp, S.V.D. (*ibid.*).

Le Néo-Hindouisme. Charles Poullain (*Etudes,* Sept.).

Christian Culture in Eastern Europe. Christopher Dawson (*Dublin Rev.,* Second Quart.).

The Spirituality of Descartes. Jacques Chevalier (*ibid.*).

Aesthetics and History: Marginal Notes on Mr. Berenson's Views. David Jones (*ibid.*).

EUROPEAN

La date du martyre de saint Saturnin de Toulouse. E. Griffe (*Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique,* July).

Saint François de Sales et les auteurs classiques. Antoine Liuima (*ibid.*).

La vie en Anjou aux XI^{e} et XII^{e} siècles. J. Boussard (*Le moyen âge,* Nos. 1-2, 1950).

Cisterciens et bastides. Ch. Higounet (*ibid.*).

Les relations politiques entre la France et l'Italia, principalement au XIV^{e} et dans la première moitié du XV^{e} siècle. G. Peyronnet (*ibid.*).

Les maisons de Medici et de Bourgogne au XV^{e} siècle. Mina Martens (*ibid.*).

Les fondateurs de la Compagnie de Jésus et l'humanisme parisien de la renaissance (1525-1536). H. Bernard-Maître, S.I. (*Nouvelle revue théologique,* Sept.).

Le procès des Jésuites devant les parlements de France. Jean Egret (*Revue historique,* July).

L'idée de nation et la jurisprudence du parlement de Paris au XV^{e} siècle. André Bossuat (*ibid.*).

San Pablo en la primera defensa de la hispanidad. Joaquin Iriarte, S.I. (*Razón y fe,* July).

Episodio inquisitorial de San Francisco de Borja. Feliciano Cereceda, S.I. (*ibid.,* Sept.).

La libertad religiosa de los protestantes en España. Eustaquio Guerrero, S.I. (*ibid.*).

En torno a la leyenda de las "barras" catalanas. Federico Udina Martorell (*Hispania,* Oct. 1949).

Reseña histórico-numismática del Reino de Murcia. Contribución al estudio de los taifas. Casto M.ª Del Rivero (*ibid.*).

Las ordenes religiosas en Cádiz, a través de las actas capitulares. Estudio cronológico (1566 a 1609). Guillermo Perea Guardeño (*ibid.*).

Sobre la ofensiva franco-turca en la tercera guerra entre Carlos V y Francisco I. Isidoro Macabich (*ibid.*).

Algo de la almoneda de bienes de doña Isabel de Valois. Luis Pérez-Bueno (*ibid.*).

Ramon Llull, docteur des missions. Ramon Sugranges de Franch (*Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft—Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire,* July).

Doctrinal político de Mosén Diego de Valera. Eduardo Toda Oliva (*Revista de estudios políticos,* July).

Ideas políticas de Sor María de Agreda. Antonio González, O.P. (*Unitas,* Apr.).

L'idéologie revolutionnaire et l'Espagne. Alphonse Roche (*Modern Language Quart.,* Sept.).

Damião de Goes und die Reformation. Elisabeth Feist Hirsch (*Theologische Zeitschrift,* 1950).

Rileggendo i "Pensieri sul' Italia di un anonimo lombardo." Emilia Morelli (*Rassegna storica del risorgimento,* Jan., 1949).

La mostra storica della Repubblica Romana del 1849. Fausto Fonzi (*ibid.*).

La genesi della rivoluzione piemontese del Ventuno in uno scrito inedito di Pietro de Rossi di Santarosa. Marino Ciravegna (*ibid.*).

Relazione inedita sulla riunione degli scienziati a Torino nel 1840. Giovanni Marro (*ibid.*).

Problemi di politica ecclesiastica nel carteggio Torino-Roma (1847-1848). Romolo Quazza (*ibid.,* July, 1949).

Garibaldi nei rapporti degli agenti diplomatici napoletani (1850- 1857). Luigi Antonio Pagano (*ibid.*).

In margine all' "Amnistia" concessa da Pio IX. A. Mercati (*Aevum,* May).

The Archives and Libraries of Postwar Germany. Lester K. Born (*American Histor. Rev.,* Oct.).

Die Einwirkung der Reformation auf die Verfassung des heiligen römischen Reiches deutscher Nation. Ernst Walter Zeeden (*Trierer theologische Zeitschrift,* July).

Anti-Jewish Riots in Germany in 1819. Eleonore O. Sterling (*Historia Judaica,* Oct.).

The Rabbis of Prague. Gutmann Klemperer (*ibid.*).

Romanticism and the Rise of German Nationalism. Hans Kohn (*Rev. of Politics,* Oct.).

The Soviet Concept of Democracy. N. S. Timasheff (*ibid.*).

Elections and Parties in Austria. Peter Berger (*Jrn. of Politics,* Aug.).

Cecoslovacchia. Ulteriori sviluppi della persecuzione religiosa. (*La civiltà cattolica,* Aug.).

Stalin e la linguistica marxista. U. A. Floridi, S.I. (*ibid.,* Sept.).

The Trials of Ukrainian Communist Literature. Clarence A. Manning (*Ukrainian Quart.,* Summer).

The Abolition of Religion in Ukraine. Bohdan Romanenchuk (*ibid.*).

My Testimony on the Genocide in Ukraine. Michael Mishchenko (*ibid.*).

The Present State of the Greek Church. Peter Hammond (*Eastern Churches Quart.,* Summer, 1950).

The Russian Military Colonies, 1810-1831. Richard E. Pipes (*Jrn. of Modern Hist.*, Sept.).

Austrian Attitudes toward *Anschluss*, Oct. 1918—Sept. 1919. S. W. Gould (*ibid.*).

The Work of Elie Halévy: A Critical Appreciation. Charles C. Gillispie (*ibid.*).

Further Additions to Modern Greek Historical Material in the Gennadeion in Athens, 1937-1949. Shirley H. Weber (*ibid.*).

Solowjews Stellung zur katholischen Kirche. W. Szytkarski (*Orientalia christiana periodica*, Vol. XVI, N. I-II).

Moralistes de Russie. S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Jitianul: Un Chrysobulle de 1689 de Constantin Brâncoveanu. F. Tailliez, S.J. (*ibid.*).

La politique étrangère soviétique. Ian Kanty (*La revue de l'Université Laval*, Nov.).

Religion within the Iron Curtain. Clarence A. Manning (*Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Sept.).

BRITISH EMPIRE

Some Problems of Early Norman Chronology. David Douglas (*English Histor. Rev.*, July).

The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity. J. E. Neale (*ibid.*).

Roger of Howden. Frank Barlow (*ibid.*).

King John and Isabelle of Angoulême. H. G. Richardson (*ibid.*).

The Evidence for the Gunpowder Plot. Hugh Ross Williamson (*Month.* Oct.)|

Hume's Four Dissertations: An Essay in Biography and Bibliography. Ernest C. Mossner (*Modern Philology*, Aug.).

The Restoration of the Hierarchy. Patrick Doran (*Clergy Rev.*, Sept.).

Homage to Hilaire Belloc. Raphael Velarde (*ibid.*, Nov.).

The Restoration of the English Catholic Hierarchy. Patrick J. Corish (*Irish Eccles. Rec.*, Oct.).

Parliament and the Restored Hierarchy: A Centenary and Its Lesson. J. T. Johnson (*Dublin Rev.*, Second Quart.).

Newman's Psychological Discovery: The Illative Sense. Dr. Zeno, O.F.M.Cap. (*Franciscan Studies*, Sept.).

Scottish Primitivism and the Historical Approach. Donald M. Foerster (*Philological Quart.*, July).

Was John Keough an Informer? Helen Landreth (*Studies*, Sept.).

AMERICAN

Problems of Locating and Using Historical Manuscripts: Introduction. Herbert A. Kellar (*Oregon Histor. Quart.*, Sept.).

Tracing Manuscript Sources. William N. Bischoff, S.J. (*ibid.*).

Where Manuscripts Should Be. Harry C. Bauer (*ibid.*).

The Use of Microfilm. S. K. Stevens (*ibid.*).

Changing Perspectives in Local History. Richard H. Shryock (*New York Hist.*, July).

Portrait of a Colonial Governor: Robert Eden I—His Entrance. Rosamond Randall Beirne (*Maryland Histor. Mag.*, Sept.).

Anti-Catholicism in Early Maryland Politics: The Puritan Influence. Denis M. Moran, O.F.M. (*Rec. of the Amer. Cath. Histor. Soc. of Phila.*, Sept.).

Father Maurice of Greece, N. Y.: A Footnote to the Liberian Mission. Robert T. McNamara (*ibid.*).

Count Luigi Castiglioni: An Early Italian Traveller to Virginia (1785-1786). Howard R. Marraro (*Virginia Mag. of Hist. and Biography*, Oct.).

Early Showboat and Circus in the Upper Valley. Joseph S. Schick (*Mid-America*, Oct.).

Cadillac, Proprietor at Detroit. Jean Delanglez (*ibid.*).

The Mississippi River through Many Eyes. William J. Petersen (*Iowa Jrn. of Hist. and Politics,* Oct. 1948).

Corpus Christi on the Menominee Reservation. Phebe Jewell Nichols (*Wisconsin Mag. of Hist.,* Autumn).

Frederick Jackson Turner and the Milwaukee *Sentinel,* 1884. Fulmer Mood (*ibid.*).

The Immigrant and the American Image in Europe, 1860-1914. Merle Curti and Kendall Birr (*Mississippi Valley Histor. Rev.,* Sept.).

Pioneer Days at the Catholic University of America. Henry J. Browne (*Catholic Educ. Rev., Jan.,* 1950).

Justice Holmes and Canon Sheehan. Emmet Lavery (*Catholic World,* Oct.).

Louis XIV et son projet de déportation—1689. Marcel Trudel (*Revue d'histoire de l'Amérique française,* Sept.).

The first Indian "Reserves" in Canada. G. F. G. Stanley (*ibid.*).

Gens de couleur libres et colons de Saint-Dominique devant la Constituante. Gabriel Debien (*ibid.*).)

Lamartine et les catholiques de France et du Canada. Robert Sylvain, E.C. (*ibid.*).

La carte des Jésuites. Sr. Marie de S.-Jean d'Ars, c.s.c. (*ibid.*).

Les Archives de la Société Historique du Saguenay. Victor Tremblay (*ibid.,* June).

Les Iles-de-la-Madeleine sous le régime français. Noel Falaise (*ibid.*).

Lamartineet les catholiques de France et du Canada. Robert Sylvain, E.C. (*ibid.*).

Colonisation au Canada sous Talon. Lionel Groulx, ptre. (*ibid.*).

James Cuthbert, père, et ses biographes. Juge Ed. Fabre-Surveyer (*ibid.*).

The Development of Philosophy in Central Canada from 1850 to 1900. John A. Irving (*Canadian Histor. Rev.,* Sept.).

Graduate Theses in Canadian History and Related Subjects (*ibid.*).

Developments of the Past Decade in the Writing of Latin American History. Arthur F. Wittaker (*Revista de historia de América,* June).

L'Amérique espagnole coloniale (1935-1949). Pierre Chaunu (*Revue historique,* July).

Notes for a Biography of Salvador Correia de Sá e Benavides, 1594-1688. Manoel Cardozo (*Americas,* Oct.).

The Reluctant Revolutionist. A Study of the Political Ideas of Hipólito da Costa, 1774-1823. Jane Herrick (*ibid.*).

The Trial of the Ecclesiastics in the Inconfidência Mineira. Ernesto Ennes (*ibid.*).

The Forty-niners of Sixteenth-Century Mexico. Philip Wayne Powell (*Pacific Histor. Rev.,* Aug.).

California Filibustering and the Hawaiian Kingdom. Andrew F. Rolle (*ibid.*).

Ramón Ortiz: Priest and Patriot. Fidelia Miller Puckett (*New Mexico Histor. Rev.,* Oct.).

El Obispado de Toluca. J. García Gutierrez (*Christus,* Nov.).

Manuel Lorenzo de Vidaurre y la inquisición de Lima. Notas sobre la evolución de las ideas políticas en el Virreinato peruano e principios del siglo XIX. Guillermo Lohmann Villena (*Revista de estudios politicos,* July).

Santa Mariana de Jesús. Constantino Bayle, S.I. (*Razón y fe,* July).

The Assassination of Sucre and Its Significance in Colombian History, 1828-1848. Thomas F. McGann (*Hispanic American Histor. Rev.,* Aug.).

Church and State in the Philippines during the Administration of Bishop Salazar, 1581-1594. Horacio de la Costa, S.J. (*ibid.*).

BOOKS RECEIVED

Aiton, Arthur Scott. *The Rise of the Latin American Nations. A Concise History.* (Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Publishers. 1950. Pp. 170.)

Andrews, Kenneth R. *Nook Farm: Mark Twain's Hartford Circle.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 288. $4.75.)

Annual Report of the School of American Research of the Archaeological Institute of America, 1949. (Cambridge: Archaeological Institute of America. 1950. Pp. 52.)

Arensberg, Conrad W. *The Irish Countryman. An Anthropological Study.* (New York: Peter Smith. 1950. Pp. xi, 216. $3.00.) The reprint of a volume published in 1937 by the Macmillan Company.

Athearn, Robert G. *Thomas Francis Meagher: An Irish Revolutionary in America.* University of Colorado Studies Series in History, No. 1. (Boulder: University of Colorado Press. 1949. Pp. 182. $2.00.)

Barck, Oscar Theodore, Walter L. Wakefield, and Hugh Talmage Lefler. *The United States: A Survey of National Development.* (New York: Ronald Press Co. 1950. Pp. x, 1079. $6.00.) A new textbook in American history.

Barzun, Jacques, Hajo Holborn, Herbert Heaton, Dumas Malone, George La Piana, and Joseph R. Strayer. *The Interpretation of History.* (New York: Peter Smith. 1950. Pp. 186. $3.00.) This is a reprint of a volume originally published by the Princeton University Press in 1943.

Binsfeld, Edmund Louis, C.PP.S. *The Shrine of the Sorrowful Mother, Marywood Ohio.* (Bellevue, Ohio: Marywood Centennial Committee. 1950. Pp. xv, 47.) This illustrated brochure marks the centennial of the shrine at Marywood, Ohio.

Blegen, Carl W., John L. Caskey, Marion Rawson, Jerome Sperling. *Troy.* Volume I. *General Introduction. First and Second Settlements.* Parts 1 and 2. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 396; xxvii, 473 plates. $36.00 for Volume I.)

Bokser, Ben Zion. *The Legacy of Maimonides.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. ix, 128. $3.75.)

Bookstaber, Philip David. *The Idea of Development of the Soul in Medieval Jewish Philosophy.* (Philadelphia: Maurice Jacobs, Inc. 1950. Pp. xi, 104. $2.00.)

Boyd, Julian P., Lyman H. Butterfield, and Mina R. Bryan (Eds.). *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson. Volume II. January 1777 to June 1779.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 665. $10.00.)

Brégy, Katherine. *Queen of Paradox.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. xiv, 221. $3.00.)

Burke, Marjorie L. *Origin of History as Metaphysic.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. 61. $2.75.) A critical examination of the notion that "history is progress."

Byrnes, Robert F. *Antisemitism in Modern France.* Volume I. *The Prologue to the Dreyfus Affair.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1950. Pp. x, 348. $5.00.)

Casson, Lionel and Ernest L. Hettich (Eds.). *Excavation at Nessana.* Volume II. *Literary Papyri.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xiv, 175. $7.50.)

Cauthen, Charles Edward. *South Carolina Goes to War, 1860-1865.* James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Volume 32. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1950. Pp. vii, 256.)

Cayré, F., A.A. *Vers l'action avec Saint Augustin. La spiritualité du Père E. d'Alzon.* (Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1950. Pp. 229. 300 fr.)

Chadwick, Owen. John Cassian. *A Study in Primitive Monasticism.* (Cambridge: University Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 213. $3.00.)

Chenu, Révérend Père, O.P. *L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ.* (Paris: Librairie Plon. 1950. Pp. 383.)

Cianfarra, Camille M. *The Vatican and the Kremlin.* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc. 1950. Pp. 258. $3.00.)

Cole, H. M. *The Lorraine Campaign.* (Washington: Historical Division, Department of the Army. 1950. Pp. xxi, 657. $10.00.) The publication of this book is the first of a projected nine-volume subseries of the ninety-odd volumes on World War II being prepared by the Office of Military History. It deals with the operations of General Patton's Third Army from the Moselle River to the Siegfried Line in the fall of 1944. The author, Dr. Hugh M. Cole, is a veteran of that campaign in the role of official historian with the Third Army. The volume contains sixty-seven photographs, fifty-one maps, a bibliographical note, a glossary of terms, and a complete index.

Coleman, William J., M.M. *The First Apostolic Delegation in Rio de Janeiro and Its Influence in Spanish America. A Study in Papal Policy, 1830-1840.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 468. $4.50.)

Committee for Constitutional Government, June 27, 28, 29, and August 25, 1950. *Lobbying: Direct and Indirect.* Part 5 of Hearings before the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities. House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, Second Session, Created Pursuant to H. Res. 298. (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. Pp. vi, 486.)

Considine, Robert. *The Maryknoll Story.* (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc. 1950. Pp. 14. $3.00.)

Cordonnier, Chanoine Ch. *Monseigneur Fuzet, Archevêque de Rouen.* Volume II. *L'Episcopat à Rouen et les grandes questions politiques de l'époque, 1899-1915.* (Paris: Beauchesne et Ses Fils. 1950. Pp. 387.)

Cosmo, Umberto. *A Handbook to Dante Studies.* Translated by David Moore. (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc. 1950. Pp. vi, 194. $1.55.)

Coulton, G. G. *Five Centuries of Religion.* Volume IV. *The Last Days of Medieval Monachism.* (New York: Cambridge University Press. 1950. Pp. xv, 833. $9.00.)

Cronin, John F., S.S. *Catholic Social Principles. The Social Teaching of the Catholic Church Applied to American Economic Life.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. xxviii, 803. $6.00.)

Davis, William Columbus. *The Last Conquistadores.* (Athens: University of Georgia Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 386. $5.00.)

Dawson, Christopher. *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture.* (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1950. Pp. xvi, 286. $3.50.)

Department of State. *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945: From the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry.* (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office. 1950. Pp. xcvi, 951. $3.25.)

Deschamps, Albert. *Les justes et la justice dans les évangiles et le christianisme primitif hormis la doctrine proprement paulinienne.* Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis, Series II, Tomus 43. (Louvain: University of Louvain. 1950. Pp. xix, 335. 260 fr.)

Dessauer, Friedrich. *Religion im Lichte der heutigen Naturwissenschaft.* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht. Carolusdruckerei. 1950. Pp. 50. D.M. 2.80.)

Donovan, Joseph P. *Pelagius and the Fifth Crusade.* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Geoffrey Cumberlege and Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. vii, 124. $3.50.)

Ellspermann, Gerard L., O.S.B. *The Attitude of the Early Christian Writers toward Pagan Literature and Learning.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1949. Pp. xxviii, 267. $3.00.) Volume LXXXII of the University's Patristic Studies.

Enchiridion de statibus perfectionis. Volume I. *Documenta ecclesiae sodalibus instituendis.* (Rome: Catholic Book Agency. 1949. Pp. lxix, 651.)

Faherty, William B., S.J. *The Destiny of Modern Woman: In the Light of Papal Teaching.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1950. Pp. xvii, 206. $3.00.)

Fairman, Charles. *American Constitutional Decisions.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1950. Pp. xiv, 489. $2.75.) This is a revised edition of the work first published in 1948 by a professor of law and political science in Stanford University. Several new cases have been added, the introduction rewritten, and the notes revised in the light of recent cases.

Faulkner, Harold Underwood, Tyler Kepner, and Edward H. Merrill. *History of the American Way.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1950. Pp. xvii, 745.) A textbook in American history.

Ferm, Vergilius (Ed.). *A History of Philosophical Systems.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. xiv, 642. $6.00.)

Fosbroke, Hughell E. W. *Divine Transcendence in the Old Testament.* (Evanston, Illinois: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary. 1950. Pp. 26.) This is the 1950 lecture of the Winslow Memorial established for the purpose of lectures in the field of Old Testament studies and archaeology.

Friedrich, Carl. *Constitutional Government and Democracy.* (Boston: Ginn and Co. 1950. Pp. xvi, 688. $5.75.) A revised edition of a textbook which was written by a professor of government at Harvard and which has gone through several editions.

Görres, Ida Friedrike. *Die leibhaftige Kirche. Gespräch unter Laien.* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht. Carolusdruckerei. 1950. Pp. xi, 271.)

Gottschalk, Louis. *Understanding History. A Primer of Historical Method.* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1950. Pp. xix, 290, vi. $2.50 text ed.; $3.25 library ed.)

Green, A. Wigfall. *The Epic of Korea.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1950. Pp. 136. $2.50.) The author of this work was attached to the American military government in Korea in various capacities. He is presently on the faculty of the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth. The work is based in good measure on his personal observations of Korean life during the year immediately after World War II.

Gregory the Great, St. *Pastoral Care. Ancient Christian Writers.* Volume XI. Translated by Henry Davis, S.J. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1950. Pp. 281. $3.00.)

Grisar, Hartmann, S.J. *Martin Luther: His Life and Work.* Adapted from the Second German Edition by Frank J. Eble. (Westminster: Newman Press. 1950. Pp. x, 609. $4.75.) A reprint.

Groulx, Lionel. *Histoire du Canada Français, depuis la decouverte.* (Montreal: L'Action Nationale. 1950. Pp. 221. $2.00.)

Guthrie, W. K. C. *The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle.* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. Pp. 168. $2.75.) A volume of the Home Study Books by a lecturer in classics at Cambridge who is also a fellow of Peterhouse.

Hesseltine, William B. *Confederate Leaders in the New South.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 147. $2.50.)

Jarratt, Rise. *Gutiérrez de Lara, Mexican-Texan. The Story of a Creole Hero.* (Austin: Creole Texana. 1949. Pp. xii, 67.)

Jones, Commander E. H. Stuart, R.N. *An Invasion That Failed. The French Expedition to Ireland of 1796.* (New York: William Salloch. 1950. Pp. xvi, 256. $3.50.)

Kann, Robert A. *The Multinational Empire: Nationalism and National Reform in the Hapsburg Monarchy, 1848-1918.* Volume I. *Empire and Nationalities.* Volume II. *Empire Reform.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. xxi, 444; xiv, 423. $12.50 for 2 vols.)

Keenan, Joseph B. and Brendan F. Brown. *Crimes against International Law.* (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1950. Pp. x, 226. $3.25.)

Lehmann-Haupt. *Peter Schoeffer of Gernsheim and Mainz with a List of His Surviving Books and Broadsides.* (Rochester: Leo Hart Co., Inc. 1950. Pp. xv, 146. $5.00.)

Lindsay, T. F. *St. Benedict: His Life and Work.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1950. Pp. 198. $2.00.)

Lipson, E. *The Growth of English Society. A Short Economic History.* (New York: Henry Holt and Co. 1950. Pp. ix, 467. $3.75.)

Litz, Francis E. (Ed.). *Letters, Grave and Gay and Other Prose of John Banister Tabb.* (Washington: Catholic University of America Press. 1950. Pp. xix, 266. $4.00.)

L'Oraison, à l'école de la Vénérable Madeleine de Saint-Joseph, carmélite déchaussée, 1578-1637. (Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1950. Pp. 32. 60 fr.)

Ludwig, Sister M. Mileta, F.S.P.A. *A Chapter of Franciscan History, 1849-1949. The Centennial History of the Sisters of the Third Order of Saint Francis of Perpetual Adoration.* (New York: Bookman Associates. 1950. Pp. xvi, 455. $5.00.)

Magie, David. *Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ.* 2 Vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xxi, 1661. $20.00 for set.)

Marcham, Frederick George. *A History of England.* (New York: Macmillan Co. 1950. Pp. xiii, 874. $5.00.) A revised edition of a text which originally appeared in 1937 by the Goldwin Smith professor of English history at Cornell University.

Maury, Jean and René Percheron. *Itinéraires romains.* (Paris: P. Lethielleux. 1950. Pp. xii, 664. 1,140 fr.) This guide to Rome has been prepared by a professor of history of art with the assistance of R. Percheron.

Maynard, Theodore. *The Odyssey of St. Francis Xavier.* (Westminster: Newman Press. 1950. Pp. viii, 364. $3.00.) A reprint of a volume which first appeared in 1936.

Miller, Perry. *The Transcendentalists: an Anthology.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xvii, 521. $6.50.)

Mollat, G. *Les papes d'Avignon, 1305-1378.* 9th edition. (Paris: Letouzey and Ané. 1950. Pp. 597.)

Moreau, E. de, Pierre Jourda, and Pierre Janelle. *Histoire de l'Eglise.* Volume XVI. *La crise religieuse du XVI^{e} siècle.* (Paris: Bloud and Gay. 1950. Pp. 461. 960 fr.)

Morison, Samuel Eliot, and Henry Steele Commager. *The Growth of the American Republic.* Volume I. *1000-1865.* Volume II. *1865-1950.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. xvi, 825; xvii, 974. $5.50 each.) This is the fourth edition revised and enlarged.)

McGee, John W. *The Catholic Church in the Grand River Valley, 1833-1950.* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: 267 Sheldon Avenue, S.E. 1950. Pp. xviii, 538.)

McNair, James B. *Simon Cameron's Adventure in Iron, 1837-1846.* (Los Angeles: 818 S. Ardmore Avenue. 1950. Pp. xi, 160. $3.85.) A monograph which furnishes new bibliographical material for the career of Lincoln's Secretary of War. The account deals with the formation and dissolution of a partnership of Cameron, S. F. Headley, Samuel Humes, and Thomas McNair for the manufacture and sale of iron, principally to what is now the Pennsylvania Railroad and the political connotations of the enterprise.

Nevins, Allan. *The Emergence of Lincoln.* Volume I. *Douglas, Buchanan, and Party Chaos, 1857-1859.* Volume II. *Prologue to Civil War, 1859-1861.* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1950. Pp. xii, 472; viii, 523. $12.50 for two vols.)

O'Brien, Grace. *The Golden Age of Italian Music.* (New York: Philosophical Library. 1950. Pp. ix, 191. $4.25.)

Overdyke, W. Darrell. *The Know-Nothing Party in the South.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press. 1950. Pp. v, 322. $4.00.)

Owens, Sister M. Lilliana, S.L., in collaboration with Gregory Goni, S.J., and J. M. Gonzalez, S.J. *Jesuit Beginnings in New Mexico.* Jesuit Studies, Southwest Series, Number I. (El Paso: Revista Católica Press. 1950. Pp. 176.)

V
19

Petrowicz, Gregorio. *L'Unione degli Armeni di Polonia con la Santa Sede, 1626-1686.* (Rome: Pontificum Institutum Orientalium Studiorum. 1950. Pp. xiv, 332.)

Popper, Karl R. *The Open Society and Its Enemies.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xii, 732. $7.50.)

Pritchard, James B. (Ed.). *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xxi, 526. $15.00.)

Public Health in New York State, 1947-1948. Sixty-eighth and Sixty-ninth Annual Reports of the State Department of Health. (Albany: New York State Department of Health. 1948 and 1949. Pp. ix, 114; x, 150.)

Reddaway, W. F., J. H. Penson, O. Halecki, and R. Dyboski (Eds.). *The Cambridge History of Poland.* Volume I. *From the Origins to Sobieski, to 1696.* (Cambridge: University Press. 1950. Pp. xiv, 607, map. $8.50.)

Rhine, Virginia. *Young Communists in USSR.* A Soviet Monograph Describing the Demands Made upon Members of the Komsomol Organization. (Washington: Public Affairs Press. 1950. Pp. 92. $2.00.)

Ring, George C., S.J. *Religions of the Far East: Their History to the Present Day.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. x, 350. $6.00.)

Sayer, Albert H., Charles Cogen, and Sidney Nanes. *Economics in Our Democracy.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1950. Pp. x, 677. $3.36.) A textbook arranged by units by three high school instructors in New York City.

Schapiro, J. Salwyn. *The World in Crisis. Political and Social Movements in the Twentieth Century.* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co. 1950. Pp. ix, 429. $4.00.)

Schlesinger, Arthur M. *The American as Reformer.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 127. $2.25.)

Schnabel, Franz. *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert.* Volume I. *Die Grundlagen.* Volume II. *Monarchie und Volkssouveranität.* Volume III. *Erfahrungswissenschaften und Technik.* (Freiburg: Verlag Herder. 1948, 1949, 1950. Pp. xi, 628; 414; ix, 500. D.M. 25; D.M. 18; D.M. 20.)

Schwiebert, E. G. *Luther and His Times. The Reformation from a New Perspective.* (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 1950. Pp. xxii, 892. $10.00 net.)

Scoville, Warren C. *Capitalism and French Glassmaking, 1640-1789.* University of California Publications in Economics, Volume XV. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press. 1950. Pp. xi, 210. $2.50.)

Smith, Vincent Edward. *Idea-Men of Today.* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co. 1950. Pp. x, 434. $5.00.)

Sonnenschein, Carl. *Notizen aus den Weltstadtbetrachtungen.* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Josef Knecht. Carolusdruckerei. 1950. Pp. xx, 200. D.M. 4.80 leinen; D.M. 3.60 engl. Broschur.)

Southern, A. C. *Elizabethan Recusant Prose, 1559-1582.* (London: Sands and Co., Ltd. 1950. Pp. xxxv, 553. $7.50.)

Steward, Julian H. *Area Research, Theory and Practice.* Bulletin 63 of the Social Science Research Council. (New York: Social Science Research Council. 1950. Pp. xix, 164. $1.50.)

Stewart, H. F. (Trans.). *Pascal's Pensées* (bi-lingual edition). (New York: Pantheon Books, Inc. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 543. $5.00.)

Taille, Maurice de la, S.J. *The Mystery of Faith.* Book II. *The Sacrifice of the* Church. (New York: Sheed and Ward. 1950. Pp. xii, 473. $5.50.)

Thomas, Mary Edith. *Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer.* (New York: William Frederick Press. 1950. Pp. 184. $3.00.)

Thompson, Craig R. (Ed.). *Inquisitio de Fide. A Colloquy by Desiderius Erasmus Roterodamus, 1524.* Yale Studies in Religion, Number XV. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 131. $3.00.)

Thompson, Laura. *Culture in Crisis. A Study of the Hopi Indians.* (New York: Harper and Bros. 1950. Pp. xxiv, 221. $4.00.)

Toynbee, Arnold J. *War and Civilization.* (New York: Oxford University Press. 1950. Pp. 165. $2.50.) Albert Vann Fowler has made selections from Toynbee's famous *A Study of History* which bear on the single problem of war and its effects on civilization.

Van Doren, Carl (Ed.). *The Letters of Benjamin Franklin and Jane Mecom.* (Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1950. Pp. xx, 380. $5.00.)

Way to Newman. (Washington: Newman Club Federation National Office. 1950.)

Weismann, Elizabeth Wilder. *Mexico in Sculpture, 1521-1821.* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1950. Pp. 224. $7.50.)

Willard, James F., William A. Morris, and William H. Dunham, Jr. (Eds.). *The English Government at Work, 1327-1336.* Volume III. *Local Administration and Justice.* (Cambridge: Mediaeval Academy of America. 1950. Pp. xviii, 285. $5.00.)

Wish, Harvey. *Society and Thought in Early America.* Volume I. *A Social and Intellectual History of the American People to 1865.* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc. 1950. Pp. xii, 612. $4.75.)

Woodbridge, George (Ed.). *UNRRA. The History of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.* 3 Vols. (New York: Columbia University Press. 1950. Pp. xxxi, 518; xii, 601; xiii, 520. $15.00.) This elaborate work was prepared by a special staff under the direction of Mr. Woodbridge, chief historian of UNRRA. It has been done with great thoroughness of research and the varied problems of the organization are covered in rich detail of facts, charts, etc.

Woodford, Frank B. *Lewis Cass, the Last Jeffersonian.* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1950. Pp. ix, 380. $5.00.)

MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY BOOKS

The Nations in the Mediaeval Universities
By Pearl Kibre. Pp. xi, 240. **$5.00**

Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388
By Kenneth M. Setton. Pp. xvi, 323. **$7.50**

Harunu'l Rashid and Charles the Great
By F. W. Buckler. Pp. vii, 64. **$2.50**

A discount of 20% is allowed to Members of the Academy and to subscribers to SPECULUM, the Academy's quarterly journal of mediaeval studies.

THE MEDIAEVAL ACADEMY OF AMERICA
1430 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

College of Notre Dame of Maryland

Charles Street Avenue, Baltimore 9, Maryland

A Catholic Institution for the Higher Education of Women

Affiliated with the Catholic University of America. Registered by the University of the State of New York and by the Maryland State Board of Education. Accredited by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. Member of American Council on Education. Courses leading to the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

Address Registrar

NOTRE DAME PREPARATORY SCHOOL
Resident and Day Pupils
Address Secretary

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the United States containing articles, unedited documents, book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.

Managing Editor: James Ferguson King

Board of Editors

Arthur S. Aiton
Carlos E. Castañeda
Bailey W. Diffie

Charles C. Griffin
Lewis Hanke
Roscoe R. Hill

James F. King
Irving A. Leonard
Alexander Marchant
Charles E. Nowell

Advisory Editors

Herbert E. Bolton
Isaac J. Cox

Clarence H. Haring
Charles W. Hackett
Dana G. Munro

J. Fred Rippy
William S. Robertson

Editorial correspondence: Professor James F. King
Room 439, Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley 4, California

Business Correspondence:
Duke University Press, College Station, Box 6697, Durham, N. C.
Subscription rates: $4.00 a year - - - Special rates to graduate students